

THE MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

A SURVEY OF UNITARIAN PACIFISM
DURING THE YEARS OF THE GREAT WAR

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

DEPARTMENT OF CHURCH HISTORY

BY
ROBERT W. LAWSON

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
JUNE, 1940

99
92
14

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	2
I. Aims of the survey	
II. What is Pacifism	
Chapter	
I. JESUS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS WAR	6
II. FROM JESUS TO CONSTANTINE	19
III. FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE QUAKERS	40
IV. UNITARIAN PACIFIST TENDENCIES UP TO 1900	56
V. TWENTIETH CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS IN UNITARIAN PACIFISM	74
VI. SUMMARY AND FORECAST	102
BIBLIOGRAPHY	106

241.16 9/10/72
 175
 Ed. Nelson & Sons
 gift of the author

INTRODUCTION

I. AIMS OF THE SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

I. AIMS OF THE SURVEY

II. WHAT IS PACIFISM

INTRODUCTION

I. AIMS OF THE SURVEY

In these days of rapid social change, it behooves all of us to come to some well thought out conclusions on the war and peace question, lest we be swept away under the flood of propaganda which threatens to submerge us. Particularly is it the duty of ministers, and others who take religion seriously, to examine the traditional attitudes on the question of the sect which claims their allegiance; to evaluate the stand of their own and other groups in the light of the highest Christian principles.

Theological differences can well be moved into the background, in times like the present, to make room for the discussion of war and peace attitudes. The alarming possibility that another major war would destroy civilization, and religion along with it, is not remote enough to be ignored. A divided church may survive after a fashion in time of peace, but another war waged in the name of God and Christ would probably complete the process of disillusionment which is even now causing a falling away from the church.

Rufus Jones says of Jesus: "It was His faith that, if you get into the world anywhere a seed of the Kingdom, a nucleus of persons who exhibit the blessed life. . . . this seed-spirit will enlarge and create a society."¹ Unfortunately the converse is also true. If the seed is allowed to lie neglected, on barren soil, it will die. Life can continue without the seed-spirit,

¹Rufus Jones, The Inner Life, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916) p. 27.

but it has no justification for doing so. Blessedness and the possibilities of blessedness change life from a tragic burden into a divine adventure. Can we afford to focus our attention on the defense of a particular type of religion and neglect conditions which might destroy all types of religion?

With these thoughts in mind I have attempted to trace the liberal strands which constitute the glorious history of Unitarian Pacifism. I say glorious in a relative, not an absolute sense. For Pacifists have been few and far between in all Christian denominations outside of the Mennonites, Friends, and Dunkards.

But in the World War the record of Unitarian ministers was outstanding. There were at least sixteen pacifist ministers in our denomination during the war, a greater number than any other denomination could produce. One asks immediately, "What were the underlying forces which made such a remarkable showing possible?" This thesis will be my attempt to provide some part of the answer to this question.

II. WHAT IS PACIFISM?

The word "pacifism" came into general use a few years before the outbreak of the World War.¹ It occurs rarely, if at all, in any standard reference work published before 1900.

Some notable definitions of "pacifism" are these:

The belief that "peaceable settlement of all controversies is possible and obligatory."²

¹Norman Angell, "Pacifism," Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933) XI, 527.

²"A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics," Ed. by Shailer Mathews and Gerald B. Smith (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921) p. 322.

The belief that "all controversies can and should be settled by mutual agreement without recourse to violence."¹

The policy of avoiding or abolishing war by the use of arbitration in settling international disputes; advocacy or support of this policy, or belief in its practicability; often, with depreciatory implication, the advocacy of peace at any price.²

In these definitions three main points are stressed which will serve as a working definition of pacifism for the purposes of this thesis:

1. The belief that all controversies can be settled by non-violent means.
2. The belief that it is our duty to use such means.
3. The refusal to use violent means under any circumstances.

It should be noted in passing that pacifism is a means of accomplishing a desired result. It is not an end, but only a technique, in the same way as war is a technique. The ends to be attained in a particular case can not, therefore, be logically used either to condemn or to justify the use of war or of pacifism as a course of action.

¹Richard Ince, A Dictionary of Religion and Religions (London: Arthur Barker Ltd., 21 Garrick St., 1935) p. 200.

²W. A. Craigie and C. T. Onions, The Oxford Dictionary (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933) p. 99.

CHAPTER I

JESUS' ATTITUDES TOWARD WAR

CHAPTER I

JESUS' ATTITUDES TOWARD WAR

Wladimir G. Bihovitch, *Toward the Understanding of*
New York: The Seaville Co., 1921, p. 7.

Acts 5:37

The Bible of Jerusalem, trans. William Winstanley (London,
New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1908), p. 663.

Bihovitch, op. cit., p. 5.

CHAPTER I

JESUS' ATTITUDES TOWARD WAR

Jesus lived in an era of political and economic unrest. The Jewish struggle for independence broke into open political revolt in 46 B.C. under the leadership of Ezechias of Galilee. He was killed and his large following temporarily defeated by the young Herod, who was at that time only the captain of the Galilean forces under Hyrcanus, the ethnarch of Judea.¹ When Jesus was twelve years old, Judas, the son of Ezechias, led a revolutionary movement against the Romans. This incident is mentioned in the Book of Acts.²

The contemporary historian Josephus refers to the revolutionaries as "robbers", as was the Roman custom at that time. But it becomes clear when one reads of their great bravery³ in the face of defeat and death, that they were more to be looked upon as political and religious idealists than as mercenary bandits.⁴

But in any case they were lawless and violent revolutionaries, smarting under the Roman rule, and desperate in their attempts to regain for themselves and their people the status of a free race, which they felt to be their birthright as God's chosen people. Jesus lived through this turmoil. It is impos-

¹Vladimir C. Simkhovitch, Toward the Understanding of Jesus (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921) p. 7.

²Acts 5:37

³The Works of Josephus, Trans. William Whiston (London, New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1906) p. 663.

⁴Simkhovitch, op. cit., p. 8.

sible to believe that he was unaware of the existence of this conflict, that he had no consciousness of race, that he was unaffected in either word or deed by the lowly state of the Jewish people.¹

In fact, just the opposite must have been the case. Jesus' whole life and thought was colored as much by his realization of the violent world in which his role was cast, as by his Messianic consciousness. He was forced by the very pressure of circumstances to answer for himself the question, "Is it the will of God that my people should continue to use violence in order to gain their independence? Or is there a better technique for them to use?"

In answering this question Jesus altered the whole outlook of the Jewish people. He turned them away from Pharisaical obedience to the letter and offered them instead dedication to a certain way of living, a spirit of which he was the incarnation. During Jesus' lifetime his followers gradually shifted from the old legalism to the new idealism. The shift was obviously incomplete, but it was change enough to start in motion a succession of events which have produced the Christianity of 1939.

According to one modern writer Jesus never explicitly justifies or condemns organized warfare.² As a matter of fact, there are only four direct references to war in the first three³ gospels, and none in the fourth. Three out of the four references are corresponding passages in the three synoptic gospels. All are illustrative of some point other than the religious implication of war itself.

¹Ibid., p. 9.

²William Herbert Perry Faunce, Religion and War, (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1918) p. 42.

³Matthew 24:6; Mark 13:7; Luke 14:31; Luke 21:9.

We must dig deeper in order to find what Jesus thought about war. Let us apply our criteria of pacifism to some larger aspects of his life.

Cadoux has treated the question of Jesus' attitude toward war with masterful scholarship and great thoroughness.¹ He first considers Jesus' reiteration of the Mosaic commandment, "Thou shalt not kill."² Whereas Jesus treats some of the Mosaic ordinances as too exacting, in this case he reinforces the Law, making it more stringent than ever before.³ This may be taken as the first important anti-war precept of Jesus.

Next come the various non-resistance teachings in the Sermon on the Mount. These occur in Matthew 5: 38-48. The essence of these teachings is as follows:

Do not resist injury. (39th verse).
 Turn the other cheek. (39th verse).
 Do not defend yourself at law. (40th verse).^{*}
 Do not resist the man who forces his will upon you.
 (41st verse).
 Be willing to give or lend at all times. (42nd verse).
 Love your enemies. (44th verse).
 Such conduct is "perfect". (48th verse).

Despite the many desperate subterfuges to which men have resorted in order to escape from the clean-cut and critical compulsion of these words, they remain the most explicit and eloquent of Jesus' teachings against violence.⁴

A third position which is pertinent to our inquiry is Jesus' refusal to advance his ideals by political or coercive means.⁵

¹C. John Cadoux, The Early Christian Attitude to War. (London: The Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., W.I., 1919).

²Ibid., p. 20.

³Ibid. (quotation from Matt. 5:21-22) p. 21.

^{*}From this, of course, it follows that one must not sue at law.

⁴Ibid., p. 22.

⁵Ibid., p. 26.

As the incident of the tribute-money shows, he felt but coldly towards the fierce yearnings of his fellow-countrymen for national independence and greatness, and he rejected the idea of the Messiah which was framed in conformity with these aspirations. At his Temptation, if we may so paraphrase the story, he refused to take possession of the kingdoms of the world, feeling that to do so would be equivalent to bowing the knee to Satan.¹

Many other scriptural references are made by the author to illustrate this point.

Fourth, Cadoux shows Jesus' disapproval of gentile "authority".² In this passage Jesus appears to make a contrast between the external authority of the state and the internal rule of the spirit. He makes it clear that his authority over his disciples is of the latter sort, the authority which depends upon spiritual insight, and not force or threat of force, to make itself valid.

As a fifth point, Cadoux mentions three texts. The first is the well-known story of the woman taken in adultery.³ Here Jesus sets aside the Mosaic Law; he judges the woman on the basis of love, sympathy, and common humanity, instead of an arid and impersonal legalism. In no other passage in the gospels does Jesus reveal so profoundly his insight into the tragedy of life. But for our purposes, it is significant to notice that Jesus expressly refuses to sanction violence in the punishment of immorality.⁴

The next passage expresses a corresponding disapproval of participation in warfare on the part of his disciples.⁵ Here Jesus bids his followers to "flee to the mountains" rather than remain to face the wrath of the destroyers of the temple.⁶

¹Ibid., p. 26.

²Ibid., quotation from Mark 10:42-45, p. 28.

³John 8:3-11.

⁴Cadoux, op. cit., p. 29.

⁵Ibid., p. 29.

⁶Mark 13:14-20.

There is some question as to the authenticity of this passage, but if it be really a saying of Jesus, it is further evidence in favor of his pacifism.

The last incident is the familiar arrest of Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane. Here Jesus rebukes Peter for using the sword in Jesus' defense. Such a decision on the part of Jesus is very specific and applicable to modern circumstances. Its meaning seems to be clear: Do not allow even your own person to be defended by the use of force and violence.¹

The author then concludes his collection of texts in this way:

To sum up, whatever may be thought of the weakness or the strength of any one of the various arguments that have just been adduced, it can hardly be questioned that, in conjunction with one another, they constitute a strong body of evidence for the belief that Jesus both adjured for himself and forbade to his disciples all use of physical violence, as a means of checking or deterring wrongdoers, not excluding even that use of violence which is characteristic of the public acts of society at large as distinct from the individual. On this showing, participation in warfare is ruled out as inconsistent with Christian principles of conduct.²

Cadoux seems to have covered all the points commonly made in supporting the contention that Jesus was a pacifist. His interpretations of scripture are substantially the same as those of other writers on the same subject. Holmes uses the passage, "Resist not evil" as a starting point in the development of his theories of non-resistance.³

Faunce accepts without comment the literal meaning of two texts which Cadoux develops: "Resist not evil." and "Put up thy sword."⁴ Eddy and Page base their personal pacifist con-

¹Cadoux, op. cit., p. 30.

²Ibid., p. 31.

³John Haynes Holmes, New Wars for Old (Dodd, Mead, & Co., 1916) p. 115. ff.

⁴William Herbert Perry Faunce, Religion and War, (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1918) pp. 42-43.

victions upon Jesus' words, "Resist not evil."¹ Thus we see no differences of opinion in the minds of these writers as to the meaning of the non-violence teachings of Jesus. They are in complete agreement with the three criteria which we have chosen to accept as our working definition of the term "pacifism".

The difficulty begins when we consider the statements of Jesus and other evidence which seems to legitimize warfare for Christians. According to Cadoux, the passage which I have translated, "Do not resist the man who forces his will upon you,"² is taken by some to mean that Jesus sanctioned compliance with the compulsory demands of the state for obedience, which would, of course, include military service. But the author shows that military service is not what is referred to here, but general state-labour instead.³

Second, we find no mention in the gospels of Jesus' express disapproval of the military calling, even when he had the opportunity to voice it.⁴ But here we have little right to argue from Jesus' silence. Obviously, he must have said and done many things of which the gospels give us no clue. Many other circumstances bearing upon this point would force us to discount it heavily as evidence of Jesus' sanction of war.⁵

Third, we examine the well-known incident commonly referred to as the Cleansing of the Temple.⁶ This is often appealed to by those who desire to point out either that Jesus' law of non-resistance was subject to exception, or else that Jesus

¹Sherwood Eddy and Kirby Page, The Abolition of War, (New York: George A. Doran Co., 1924) Part 1, Ch. 5.

²Matthew 5:41.

³Cadoux, op. cit., p. 32.

⁴Matthew 8:5-13.

⁵Cadoux, op. cit., p. 33-35.

⁶Matthew 21:12ff; Mark 11:15-17; Luke 19:45ff; John 2:13-17.

here broke one of his own laws. Faunce says of this incident, "When he found such double-faced leaders in the forecourt of the sacred temple, he did not rely on words alone, but with a brandished whip of braided cords he drove them out, and with the force of his mind and his body purified the national shrine."¹

Cadoux analyzes the matter in a less superficial and more scholarly way. He finds the whip of cords mentioned in the fourth gospel only, which is regarded by most scholars as more of an idealization than an account of historical incidents. Also, the incident occurs at a different time in the fourth gospel from that in the other three. Furthermore, there is no evidence to indicate that the whip was used on any human being. And last of all, the Greek word which means literally "to cast out", which is used to describe Jesus' action inside the Temple, is used in other parts of the Bible in the sense of "expel", "take", "bring", "send", etc. Hence it does not necessarily mean any more than an authoritative dismissal.

It is obviously impossible for one man to drive out a crowd by physical force or even by the threat of it. What he can do is to overawe them by his presence and the power of his personality, and expel them by an authoritative command. That apparently is what Jesus did. In any case, no act even remotely comparable to wounding or killing is sanctioned by his example on this occasion.²

Bushnell, quoted by Cadoux on this point writes with great artistry as follows:

... . it is the very point of the story, not that he, as by mere force, can drive so many men, but that so many are seen retiring before the moral power of one--a mysterious being, in whose face and form the indignant flush of innocence reveals a tremendous feeling they can nowise comprehend, much less are able to resist.³ *

¹Faunce, op. cit., p. 45. ²Cadoux, op. cit., p. 35.

³Horace Bushnell, Nature and the Supernatural, (New York: Charles Scribner, 1859) pp. 283-284.

*It is to be kept in mind that Faunce never acquired a

Cadoux's fourth point is Jesus' famous prophecies of future wars.¹ These passages seem to indicate Jesus' belief that God used catastrophe to punish sinners. If God uses the Roman armies as the rod of his anger, is it not furthering God's plan to help the soldiers in their work of destruction?

In opposition to such an inference, Cadoux asks us to consider the following points:

1. That wherever the inflection appears as the direct act of God, the language is always highly parabolic, and the exact interpretation proportionately difficult; nothing more than the single point of divine punishment is indicated by these parables; even the more fundamental idea of divine love--the context in which the divine severity must admittedly be read--is omitted. Can we infer from the parable of the hardworked slave, illustrating the extent of the service we owe to God, that Jesus approves of a master so treating his slaves, or from the parabolic description of himself plundering Satan, that he sanctions burglary?

2. That the difference between divine and human prerogatives in the matter of punishing sin is deep and vital, God's power, love, knowledge, and authority making just for Him what would be unjust if done by man.

3. That, in the case of the Jewish war, the instruments of God's wrath were unenlightened Gentiles who in a rebellion could see nothing better to do than to crush the rebels; duty might well be very different for Christian disciples.

4. That the conception of foreign foes being used to chastise God's people was one familiar to readers of the Hebrew Scriptures, and did not by any means imply the innocence of the foes in question.

5. That, while Jesus holds up the divine perfection in general as a model for our imitation, yet, when he descends to particulars, it is only the gentle side of God's method of dealing with sinners--to the express exclusion of the punitive side--which he bids us copy, and which he himself copied in that supreme act in which he revealed God's heart and moved sinners to repentance, namely, his submission to the cross.²

reputation as a profound scholar of the Bible. Cadoux, on the other hand, is considered one of the world's great Biblical scholars. His remarks should be given much greater weight than Faunce, Holmes, Eddy, Page, etc. The others are introduced merely for purposes of comparison and contrast.

¹Matthew 24:28; Mark 13:2,7,14-20; Luke 17:22-37; 19:41-44; 23:28-31.

²Cadoux, op. cit., p 36.

In spite of these moving words I feel that Cadoux somewhat overcomplicates the matter. For a prophecy of future wars is in no way to be taken as an advocacy of the war method. One may feel, as Jesus did, that certain events indicated that war was sure to occur at a certain time and place. But he is not relieved thereby of the moral duty of working against war, of trying to prove himself wrong in his prediction, as it were. A prophet may predict destruction and violence, as did Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah, and at the same time condemn all the forces tending to make the prediction come true.

Cadoux's fifth point is Jesus' illustrative allusions to war.¹ He disposes of some of them as being purely metaphorical in character, used merely to illustrate some totally different point.² (This point was mentioned before on page 7)

The passage, "I come not to send peace but a sword,"³ is construed by Cadoux to mean simply that Jesus knew that his message would be misunderstood by many, and that antipathies would inevitably arise against him and his followers. It is ever thus when new ideas appear in the world.

That this is what Jesus must have meant is made quite clear by Cadoux. Yet Faunce seems to accept the statement literally, regardless of context. He says, "There is no qualification in his clear statement, 'I come not to send peace, but a sword.'" Faunce, a non-pacifist, a popularizer rather than a deep scholar, is a good example of the dire effect of war propaganda on an otherwise clear mind.

The author also mentions the incident in the Lukan story

¹Ibid., p. 38.

²Ibid., p. 38, quotes Luke 14:31-33; Matthew 11:12; Luke 16:16.

³Matthew 10:34.

of the Last Supper, where Jesus tells whichever of his disciples has no sword to "sell his cloak and buy one." The story ends with Jesus apparent assertion that two swords are enough.¹ As Cadoux points out, two swords are not enough to defend twelve men. Another explanation of the meaning of this passage must be sought. In any case, it cannot be taken as a literal statement of warlike advice.

Yet here again Faunce feels that Jesus was giving "explicit direction" to his "terrified disciples".²

Faunce and Cadoux agree that "Jesus accorded a certain recognition to the civil governments of his day."³ But while Faunce comes at once and uncritically to the conclusion that such an attitude must be listed on the anti-pacifist column in the evaluation of Jesus,⁴ Cadoux tries to dig deeper and discover what the implications of such a stand really were. He writes as follows:

. . . . does not, in particular, the command to 'Give back to Caesar the things that are Caesar's,' carry with it the duty of rendering military service if and when the government demands it? Caesar, it was well understood, had formally exempted the Jews from service in his legions, and the question was not whether they should fight for him, but whether they should bow to his rule and pay his taxes. To part with one's property at the demand of another person does not make one responsible for all that person's doings, nor does it imply a readiness to obey any and every command that that person may feel he has a right to issue.⁵

Cadoux next examines a common assumption: "That obedience to the non-resistance teachings of Jesus is so obviously inconsistent with the peace and well-being of society that he could not have meant this teaching to be taken literally."⁶ He concludes, upon examination of all the factors, involved, that the

¹Cadoux, op. cit., quotes Luke 22:35-38, p. 39.

²Faunce, op. cit., p. 44. ³Cadoux, op. cit., p. 40.

⁴Faunce, op. cit., p. 45. ⁵Cadoux, op. cit., p. 41.

⁶Cadoux, op. cit., pp. 42, 43, 44.

non-resistance teachings of Jesus apply only to the disciples, that much of positive action accompanied the negativity of mere non-resistance, that the growth of the Christian community is gradual, and that these gradual processes would act to gradually transform and elevate society, not destroy it.¹

Lastly, Cadoux brings up the application of the "interim ethic" to this problem. He finds, upon critical examination of the texts, that the Gospels contain both non-apocalyptic and apocalyptic sayings of Jesus. We cannot arbitrarily consider one element and ignore the other.²

The interim ethic theory is, as we have said, the last fortress of militarism on Christian soil. Driven from that stronghold it has no choice but to take refuge over the border. Its apologists eventually find that they have no option but to argue on grounds inconsistent with the supremacy of Christianity as a universal religion or as a final revelation of God. Most of the arguments we hear about 'the lesser of two evils', 'living in an imperfect world', 'untimely virtues', and so on, reduce themselves in the last analysis to a renunciation of Christianity, at least for the time being, as the real guide of life. In the fierce agony of the times, the inconsistency is unperceived by those who commit it; or, if it is perceived, the sacrifice of intellectual clearness becomes part of the great sacrifice for which the crisis calls. But he, to whose words men have so often fled when the organized Christianity of the hour appeared to have broken down, or at any rate could not solve the riddle or point the way, will, when the smoke has cleared from their eyes, be found to possess after all the secret for which the human race is longing; and the only safe 'Weltpolitch' will be seen to lie in simple and childlike obedience to him who said, "Happy are the gentle, for they will inherit the earth."³

In conclusion it appears that Cadoux pictures Jesus in a way not inconsistent with the pacifist principles which we have chosen as a working definition. Indeed, the writer says explicitly later in the book that Jesus' principles of non-resistance were binding on his disciples, and that all attempts

¹Ibid., pp. 42, 43, 44. ²Ibid., p. 45.

³Ibid., pp. 46, 47.

to emancipate Christian disciples from these rulings rested and still rest "on various easily demonstrated misapprehensions."¹

Holmes, and Eddy and Page, reach the same conclusions by the use of somewhat less scholarly research. Faunce, of course, disagrees. Unfortunately there is little literature on the non-pacifist interpretation of Jesus that is scholarly. And that which is scholarly raises only the same issues which Cadoux brings up, analyzes, and answers.

There will always remain differences of opinion upon these interpretations of the life of Jesus, as long as independent thinking is possible. It is probably an anachronism to force Jesus into a particular position, the outward circumstances of which are incomprehensible to the man of today, to apply a Twentieth Century term to a First Century situation. But for myself and many others who follow the general approach of Cadoux, the facts seem to justify referring to Jesus as a pacifist.

Certainly the followers of Jesus understood his teachings to embrace pacifism; and they built their lives on that interpretation, with uncompromising dedication for many years, as we shall see.

¹Ibid., pp. 46, 47.

CHAPTER I

FROM JESUS TO CONSTANTINE

CHAPTER II

FROM JESUS TO CONSTANTINE

CHAPTER II

FROM JESUS TO CONSTANTINE

Immediately following the death of Jesus, his disciples were scattered. But they soon reassembled with renewed courage, convinced that their Master had not died, but was still with them and would soon return to judge the world.¹

Thrown upon their own resources, it was only natural that they should first consider the problem of adjustment to the State. How was it possible for them to preserve the teachings of Jesus in the midst of a society which was thought to be totally bad?

This question occupied the minds of the early Christians during the time in which the Jerusalem community was rapidly growing and becoming a church. However, it appears that the vast bulk of Christians did not for a time have to choose between the authority of the militaristic Roman State and the love-teaching of Jesus. Two factors contributed to this temporary delay in the unavoidable clash between Roman militarism and Christian pacifism.

In the first place, the followers of Jesus accorded the same partial recognition and obedience to the State that the

¹Cadoux suggests that we keep in mind, as we consider questions such as this, that silence on the part of the early Christians in regard to problems which may seem important to us should not be interpreted as "a decision given after full reflection." Cecil John Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 38 George St., 1925), p. 116.

Master himself did.¹

They accepted the State as the temporary framework in which they were placed; and they practiced obedience to its laws in all things not directly contrary to Jesus' teachings.

In the second place, the Christians were legally disqualified from serving in the imperial armies, as they were still classed as Jews by the Romans.

The government could nearly always get as many soldiers as it needed by ordinary methods of enlistment, without making wide use of its powers to compel the unwilling. Such forcible recruiting as did occur took place more and more among the least civilized populations of the Empire. Gentile free and freed-men who were Christians would thus hardly ever be called upon to serve. . . . Even the presence of converted soldiers in the church did not raise the issue; for, neither on the one hand would such men, being inured to their duties, be likely suddenly to find wrong what they had all their life been taught to regard as honorable; nor, on the other hand, would the Christian civilians, who welcomed them into fellowship, and who, living far away from the battlefield, could only too easily ignore the question at stake, be likely to reproach or condemn them or urge them to abandon their calling. At the same time, the very presence of such men in the Church tended unconsciously to prejudice Christian judgment in a certain direction, before ever the issue was definitely raised.²

Another problem which the early church had to face was the apparent contradiction between the wrathful God of the Old Testament and the love ethic of Jesus. If both were to be accepted as true and holy, which should be followed as a standard of conduct?

When we examine the historical facts, it seems that the early Christians were totally unconscious of the existence of such an important problem. "Stephen and Paul both recalled with a glow of patriotic enthusiasm how God had subdued and

¹Cecil John Cadoux, The Early Christian Attitude to War, (London: Headley Bros. Publishers, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., W.1., 1919), p. 40. Also see p. 15 of this thesis.

²Cadoux, Early Church & World, op. cit., pp. 116-117.

destroyed the Canaanites before their ancestors under Joshua.¹ The author of Hebrews reminds his readers how 'by faith the walls of Jericho fell down,' and he mentions in his catalog of the heroes of faith, 'Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephtah, David, Samuel, and the prophets, who by means of faith subdued kingdoms, ... escaped the edge of the sword, became strong in war, routed armies of foreigners.'² Whatever was recorded and approved by an Old Testament author was not regarded as a fitting subject for Christian criticism. There was then no historical sense with which to discern development in man's knowledge of God's Will; and the Christian mind thus lacked, not only the inclination, but also the means of properly comparing the ethic of their own faith with that of a long distant past. The warlike habits of their ancestors and their own peaceful principles formed two separate realms, both of which they recognized, without attempting, or feeling any need to attempt, to harmonize them."³

All this does not mean that, because Christians did not condemn the Old Testament in the light of the new teachings, they felt called upon to follow the old in practice. The early Christians of the first century were loyal to the teachings of Christ; the ancient Hebrew wars had no influence on Christian conduct at the time because they were merely assigned to a compartment of the mind which had nothing to do with Christian living. But later, as we shall see, when participation in war became a more pressing Christian concern, the traditional acceptance of the Old Testament as holy and true did much to prevent

¹Acts 7:45; 13:19 quoted Ibid., p. 117.

²Hebrews 11:30-34 quoted Ibid., pp. 117-118.

³Ibid., p. 118.

a complete renunciation of war.¹ This troublesome factor still keeps men from taking a pacifist position today.

After the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. Christian Messianism became an important factor in the Scriptural writings. The writer of Matthew interprets the Fall as one of a series of events which are to lead up to the Parousia.² The pages of the Apocalypse give a staggering portrayal of the warrior-christ vanquishing the Beast, winning the victory with the help of angel armies, slaying his enemies in a bloody conflict. The Apocalypse, though Christian revelation was a typical example of Jewish apocalyptic literature. As such, it was relegated to the same compartment as the Old Testament. Regardless of what God might do in the Old Testament or the warrior-christ in the Book of Revelation, the duty of the Christian man on earth was still that of following the gentle Jesus and bearing his Cross.

Nevertheless, this belief in a warrior-christ who would conquer his enemies played its part, like the reverent acceptance of the Old Testament wars, in preventing a whole-hearted rejection of warfare as an impermissible element in Christian conduct.³

Thus was the entering wedge driven, which led, many years later, to the holy wars of Christendom.

In spite of these factors which tended toward a possible future reconciliation between war and Christianity, peace held a very high place in the Christian scale of values. This can best be shown by a brief survey of the attitudes of some of the better known fathers and doctors of the church prior to the end of the third century.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 185.

²Matt. 24:6-8; Luke 21:9-11.

³Cadoux, Early Church and World, op. cit., pp. 186-187.

⁴"Peace, of course, meant a number of different things to the early Christian. It meant reconciliation between himself

Paul tells the Romans, "If possible, as far as lies in your power, be at peace with all men."¹

The author of Hebrews says, "Pursue peace with all."²

The writer of Matthew quotes the words of Jesus, "Happy are the peacemakers."³

Luke tells us that the host of angels at the birth of Jesus sang, "Glory in the highest to God and on earth peace among men whom He favors."⁴

In the so-called first Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, written about 94 A.D., we find this petition, "Give concord and peace to us and to all who inhabit the earth, as Thou gavest to our fathers."⁵

In the second century, the Christians were still ignored by the great majority of pagans. But they were beginning to produce competent Apologists, who called forth much discussion and opposition.

Ignatius of Antioch lived through the age of transition, in which the Apostolic Fathers disappear and the Apologists take their place. Inspired by the suffering and death of his Lord, his greatest ambition in life was to undergo similar martyrdom.

and God; it meant the stilling of turbulent passions and evil desires in his own heart; it meant the harmony and concord that normally reigned within the Christian community; it meant (to Paul, for instance, in writing 'Ephesians') the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile; it meant immunity from annoyance and persecution at the hands of pagans; it meant also freedom from the distractions, toils, and dangers of actual war."

Cadoux, *Early Christian Attitude to War*, op. cit., p. 58.

¹Romans 12:18.

²Hebrews 12:14.

³Matthew 5:9.

⁴Luke 2:14.

⁵I Clement 60:4.

All of these quoted in Cadoux, *Early Xian Attitude to War*, op. cit., p. 59.

His wish was fulfilled in the reign of Trajan (98-117), perhaps in 108.¹

Ignatius was a true pacifist, according to our definition. He writes, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, "Nothing is better than peace, by which all war of those in heaven and those on earth is abolished."²

Justin Martyr, the best known apologist of the second century (C. 150) writes that Christians seek a heavenly realm of peace.

The prophecy of Isaiah, that swords shall be beaten into ploughshares, and spears to pruning hooks, begins to find fulfillment in the mission of Christians. For 'we refrain from making war on our enemies,' but gladly go to death for Christ's sake. Christians are warriors of a different world, peaceful fighters, but in fidelity to their cause and in readiness to die they excel all others. 'For Caesar's soldiers possess nothing which they can lose more precious than their life, while our love goes out to that eternal life which God will give us by his might.'³

Tatian, an Assyrian convert to Christianity and a pupil of Justin, was another influential opponent of war. He "equated war and murder, and said that the demons excited war by means of oracles."⁴

Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, was a great lover of peace as well as a great opponent of Valentinus and his Gnostic School. He is the second of a succession of Christian writers, which include Justin, Tertullian, Origen, Pseudo-Cyprian, and Eusebius,

¹Donald W. Riddle, The Martyrs, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 150.

²Ignatius' Epistle to the Ephesians, 13:2, quoted in Cadoux, Early Xian Attitude to War, op. cit., p. 60.

³The first Apology of Justin, Ps. 11, 39, quoted by G.J. Heering, the Fall of Christianity, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd. Museum St., 1930) p. 46.

⁴Cadoux, Early Xian Attitude to War, op. cit., p. 50.

who make much of the "ploughshare" prophecy.¹ All of these writers urge, each in his own way, that this prophecy "is being fulfilled in the extension of Christianity, the adherents of which are peace-loving people, who do not make war."²

Clement of Alexandria, the great leader of Stoic Christianity, considered war to be wasteful, intemperate, and dishonorable. He says of the Christians, "We are being educated, not in war, but in peace;" "We, the peaceful race" are more temperate than "the warlike races," "we have made use of one instrument, the peaceful word only, wherewith we honour God."³

The numerous works of Tertullian, the "African Cicero," make it quite certain that he was a lover of peace. He asks, in an attempt to defend the Christian meetings, "To whose danger did we ever meet together? What we are when we are separated, that we are when we are gathered together; what we are as individuals, that we are as a body, hurting no one, troubling no one."⁴ He calls the Christian "the son of peace."⁵

Despite the attempts of these great men to oppose the potential militarism of Christianity, the teachings of Jesus slowly became obscured. Day by day, the growing Christian groups became less opposed to war and violence. The idea that the rulers of the Roman State were divinely appointed was one of many factors which served to reconcile Christians to the warlike methods of the government.

¹Isaiah 2:3f., Micah 4:2f.

²Cadoux, *Early Xian Attitude to War*, *op. cit.*, p. 60f.

³Clement of Alexandria's *Paedagogus* I, 12:98f, II 2:32, 4:42, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 64.

⁴Tertullian's *Apology*, 39 (i. 478).

⁵Tertullian's *De Corona Militis*, 11 (ii. 92).

Another was the fear, common to both Christians and Romans, of barbarian invasions. As long as the divinely appointed Emperors waged war skilfully, the Christians were protected from savages who might persecute them even more bitterly than the State, or even destroy them. They must have felt some inward loyalty to the Emperors for preserving an orderly State.

In addition, the presence of converted soldiers in the church paved the way for converted pagans to join the army after their conversion. The net effect was the same, so there was little need to bother about just when the conversion occurred.

The conflict between the Old and New Testament teachings was a constant source of confusion, also, as we have already seen. This troublesome contradiction is still a fruitful source of controversy today for those who believe in the plenary inspiration of the Bible.

Up to the year 170, however, we have no definite evidence to prove that any Christians had joined the Roman army. The first evidence we have of Christians appearing in the Roman legions is found in Tertullian's and Apollinarius' account of one of the Emperor's campaigns (173-174) against the barbarians called Quadi. A considerable number of Christians were members of the Twelfth Legion. The account tells of the Christian's prayers for rain in the midst of a drought which was causing the soldiers much suffering. The prayers were successful; a shower soon occurred, which refreshed the Roman troops and discomfited the enemy.¹

After this, more and more Christians are found in the Legions. The later works of Tertullian, (between 198 and 211),

¹Cadoux, *Early Church and the World*, op. cit., pp. 277-278.

give us our first evidence that the Roman army now contained Christians who had joined after being converted.¹

The prevailing view of early Christianity was that there were three deadly, unforgiveable sins; idolatry, murder, and licentiousness.² Those Christians who joined the army might not have been forced actively to worship the State. We have no evidence on this matter. And obviously they could be good soldiers without being licentious. But they must have had to carry out the orders of their superior officers; they must have attacked and slain their enemies when commanded to do so. Neither true Christianity nor pacifism was therefore possible for the soldier. The Christian circumbentation of the teachings of Jesus was well under way.

Of course, the majority of Christians still felt the shedding of blood to be absolutely sinful. But the presence of soldiers in the church and the troublesome inconsistencies in the Bible in regard to war and peace kept them from completely renouncing war. These inconsistencies were two in number.

The first, which we have already had occasion to mention, was the difference between the character of God portrayed in the Old Testament and the revelation of the will of God portrayed by Jesus. At first, no effort was made to solve the problem, simply because it was not viewed as a problem at all. Luke, Paul, and Clement of Rome accept the Old Testament as "a type" of sacred literature divinely foretelling the coming of Jesus. At the same time they preach love, meekness, and non-resistance to injury. As a rule, the Christian mind was satisfied to

¹Ibid., p. 422.

²Welliston Walker, A History of the Christian Church, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918), p. 100.

ignore this problem. But for the heretic Marcion, "an old-world Count Tolstoi," a man of deep piety, it was unthinkable that the God which Jesus revealed should be the same ancient God who did not hesitate to strike men dead for a real or fancied infraction of his arbitrary laws. Marcion therefore rejected the authority and holiness of the Old Testament, while accepting its historicity only. The church condemned Marcion as a heretic and drove him from Rome. Origen was the chief opponents of the Marcionite heresy; his answer to the problem was that of allegory. The wars of Joshua are interpreted to convey merely the strife against sin and the powers of darkness. Thus Origen sacrifices the historicity of the Old Testament in order to preserve its spiritual overtones. The time has now arrived for us to renounce war, regardless of what happened in the past, for a "new dispensation" has occurred in Jesus.

To those who ask us whence we have come, and who is our leader, we say that we have come in accordance with the counsels of Jesus to cut down our warlike and arrogant swords of argument into ploughshares and we convert into sickles the spears we formerly used in fighting. For we no longer take 'sword against a nation,' nor do we learn 'any more to make war' having become sons of peace for the sake of Jesus, who is our leader, instead of the ancestral (customs) in which we were strangers to the covenants.¹

Despite Origen's noble attempt to answer Marcion, his courage in the face of the attacks of Celsus, and his loyalty to the Church and to the teachings of Jesus, he failed. His writings were subsequently condemned as heretical, because they proved so useful to the Arians. He stands today neither in the liberal nor the orthodox tradition, but slightly outside of both.

In any case, he failed to answer Marcion. The orthodox

¹Origen's *Contra Celsum*, (248 A.D.), 5:33, quoted in Cadoux, *Early Church & World*, op. cit., p. 424.

church demanded that the historicity of the Old Testament be maintained. Only in modern times did we discover the true answer; the theory of the progressive revelation of the divine will and character. Even today, many seem unable to grasp this important concept.

Celsus, the Greek Platonist who was an opponent of Christianity, has already been mentioned. His attacks on Christianity as vastly inferior to Greek philosophy are sincere. He brings out in bold relief the contradictions between the Old and New Testaments. Celsus and Marcion are to be remembered as two great ancient critics, to whom the Church should feel indebted. They forced Christianity to come to terms with important internal problems which had hitherto been allowed to lie dormant.

The other factor which kept Christians from taking an absolute stand on the war and peace question was the use of military figures of speech by the great church leaders. Even Jesus found warlike metaphors to be a convenient way of driving home a point. He informs his disciples that he has not come to bring peace to the earth but rather a "sword."¹ He tells the parable of the two kings who meet in battle.² But outside of these two purely symbolic uses of the war concept, Jesus always mentions violence only in order to condemn its use.

Paul seems to have been the initiator of the custom of using illustrations taken from military life. Practically every one of his letters contains allusions, such as "wearing faith and love for a coat of mail, and helmeted with the hope of salvation;"³ or "the weapons of uprightness for the right hand and the left,"⁴

¹Matt. 10:34-35.

²Luke 14:31-35.

³I. Thess. 5:8-9.

⁴II Cor. 5:8.

"It is important to note that Paul, as if aware of the liability of such language to misconstruction, twice went out of his way to remind his readers that in using it he was not referring to earthly warfare."¹

Cadoux also mentions Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch as examples of this same type of thought.²

Of the earlier Apologists, only Justin and Tatian refer to warfare as a type or pattern of Christian life.³ Justin, in his zeal to convince the Greek world of the validity of Christianity, asserted that the Christians were the best allies the emperors had in promoting peace. He writes,

We more than all men are your helpers in peace, seeing that we hold this view, that it is impossible for an evil-doer or a covetous man or a conspirator or a virtuous man to escape God's notice, and that every one goes to eternal punishment or eternal salvation according to the merit of his deeds.⁴

In this way did Justin unwittingly bring pacifist Christianity and militaristic Rome one step nearer together.

The pugnacious and militant peace-lover Tertullian was unfortunately very fond of military figures of speech, despite his aversion to actual warfare. Origen also, saw the growth of Christianity as a perpetual spiritual warfare against evil. Cadoux mentions in addition to these writers, the following men and works, in connection with the use of military terminology: Minucius Felix, Cyprian, Pseudo-Cyprian, The Acts of Thomas, The Acts of Peter, Irenaeus, and Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria.⁵

¹II Cor. 10:3ff; Eph. 6:12, quoted by Cadoux, *Early Church and World*, op. cit., p. 119.

²Ibid., p. 187.

³Ibid., p. 272.

⁴Justin Martyr, I Apologia 12:1, Ibid., p. 265.

⁵Ibid., p. 410.

Yet in spite of all the forces working directly toward the sanctioning of warfare, the tendency to refuse service in the legions was strong even in the middle of the third century.¹ Enlistment was still voluntary. Those Christians who were in the army undertook to defend themselves from the criticisms of their brother Christians by simply appealing to Scripture. We have seen how Origen failed in his attempts to explain away the discrepancy between Old and New Testaments.

It was still customary, by the beginning of the fourth century, for Christians to condemn war and advocate peace. But these attitudes were more academic than practical. In other words, the presumption of a strong Christian aversion to war on moral and ethical grounds remains; but there is no more talk of absolute renunciation of war. Since the days of Marcus Aurelius, the barbarians had become increasingly bold in their attacks upon the Roman Empire; so Christians could not avoid facing the question, "What shall we do if the State collapses?" and in the minds of most men, it seemed safer to try to defend the relatively stable Roman State from its enemies than to let it be overthrown and take a chance with the savage barbarians. Thus was created at least a presumption in favor of the State and its militarism. Under the strong urge of self-preservation in the face of great danger, many Christians chose service in the Roman army as a necessary evil. They felt, many of them with deep regret, that it was necessary to prepare to defend by military force the Roman government and its divinely chosen head. In this way, the argument as to the necessity of fighting a defensive war arose. It has remained the favorite of the peace-loving non-pacifists ever since.

¹Ibid., p. 438-439.

All this time Cyprian, Commodius, and Arnobius are perpetuating the militaristic terminology of Clement, Origen, and Tertullian. Cadoux remarks:

It is significant that the word 'paganus' which later became a common term for 'non-Christian', meant, strictly speaking, 'civilian', as opposed to 'soldier', and the development of its usage indicates how strongly the idea of the Christian as the soldier par excellence had permeated the mind of Latin Christianity.¹

Cadoux traces this usage of the word "pagan" back to Tertullian.²

Cadoux remarks that by the year 416, non-Christians were forbidden to serve in the army.³

From the middle of the third century up to the time of Constantine, there were a number of Christian martyrdoms for refusal to take part in war. Eusebius tells the story of the Christian military officer Marinus, martyred in 260. In this case Marinus was beheaded for refusing to worship the emperor, and for choosing the Gospels in preference to a sword when forced to decide.⁴

In 295, Maximilianus was martyred at Teveste for refusing to enter the legions.⁵ Here the question of sacrificing to idols or to the Emperor is not even brought up. Maximilianus simply insists that he is a Christian, and as such, cannot support that which he feels to be evil.⁶

Marcellus, the centurian, was martyred at Tingis (West Mauretania) in 298. Unlike Marinus, he did not wait until he was forced to decide between the State and the teachings of Jesus.

¹Ibid., p. 569.

²Ibid., p. 409.

³Ibid., p. 589.

⁴The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, VII, XV., Ibid., p. 573-574.

⁵Ibid., p. 574.

⁶Cadoux, Early Xian Attitude to War, op. cit., p. 148-151.

He insisted on resigning his office; he renounced all loyalty that conflicted in any way with service to Jesus Christ, the one true king. "When he was sentenced to death, Cassianus, the clerk of the court, loudly protested, and flung his writing materials on the ground, declaring that the sentence was unjust; he suffered death a few days after Marcellus."¹

In 305, Typasius, a soldier of Mauretania who had received an honorable discharge from the Emperor Maximian in order to devote the rest of his life to the study of religion, was called back to the ranks. He refused, and therefore suffered martyrdom.²

The veteran Julius was beheaded in Moesia for refusing to sacrifice.³

Many other individuals were thus slain for their Christian convictions. But the vast majority of Christian soldiers had no such scruples. They felt it to be most honorable to help their divinely-appointed emperor turn back the savage hordes of barbarians. The teachings of Jesus were tucked away in the same compartment that contained the Old Testament and the Apocalypse of John.

Dr. Charles E. Jefferson once wrote: "The apostles at the very start had to face the question whether they were to hearken to the civil rulers rather than to God. They settled it then and there and they settled it right."⁴

We have seen the gradual drift away from the teachings of Jesus and the conduct of the apostles. We have surveyed the

¹Ibid., p. 152-153. ²Ibid., p. 153.

³Cadoux, Early Church and World, op. cit., p. 576-577.

⁴Quoted in Sherwood Eddy and Kirby Page, The Abolition of War, (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1924), p. 82.

growth of Christianity, occurring both because of and in spite of persecution. It remains for us to note briefly the circumstances which causes the complete collapse of all anti-war sentiment under the Emperor Constantine.

The time had not yet come for any spokesman of the Church to come out definitely in favor of the war-method. But some writers come very close to such a position.

Thus Cyprian reckons it among the calamities of the time that the numbers and efficiency of soldiers are decreasing. . . . Methodius says that kings, rulers, generals, and various other classes of people, are useful to themselves and to the community, if they are temperate. . . . Lactantius says that God made man naked and unarmed, because he could be armed by his talent and clothed by his reason. He blames Epicurus for his policy of being all things to all men, by virtue of which he forbade the timid man to serve as a soldier. He counts the loss of military discipline among the disasters of Anti-Christ. . . .¹

Thus we have reached one of the great turning points in Christian history. Christians had become so bound up in the temporal order that they could no longer afford to remain indifferent to "this evil age."

It is customary to regard the date 312 A.D. as the time when the church definitely lost its conscience on the question of war; for in this year the Emperor Constantine became favorable to Christianity. A year later, Constantine and Licinius issued a remarkable document, the Edict of Milan, one of the world's great decrees of religious toleration. In effect, it proclaimed that henceforth it should not be unlawful to be a Christian; everyone was free to follow whatever religion suited him the best.

Constantine was a political opportunist. He knew little or nothing about the theological issues which were agitating the religious world. But he did want peace and unity in his

¹Quoted in Cadoux, Early Ch. & World, op. cit., pp570, 571, 572.

domain. The famous Council of Nicea in 325 was a result of this desire. Constantine always favored Christianity, but did not officially join the church by undergoing the rite of baptism until a few years before his death in 337.

Thus a wonderful change was wrought in the lives of the Christians. The days of the persecutions under Diocletian were a thing of the past; the imprisoned Christians were released; the churches were filled to overflowing.

The Christians regarded the defeat of the tyrannical successors of Diocletian by Licinius and Constantine as a "divine chastisement for the sufferings they had inflicted on the Church."¹ The defeat of Lactantius by Constantine after Lactantius had become anti-Christian, was viewed in a similar way.

It was, therefore, with immense satisfaction that the Christians witnessed his final defeat in 323. Constantine was at last sole ruler of the Roman world. The church was everywhere free from persecution. Its steadfastness, its faith, and its organization had carried it through its perils. But, in winning its freedom from its enemies, it had come largely under the control of the occupant of the Roman Imperial Throne. A fateful union with the State had begun.²

By 324, Christianity was definitely the most favored religion in the Empire. From this time on, Constantine was for all practical purposes a Christian, mainly because he felt that the God of the Christians had helped him to defeat his enemies.

The church is now definitely allied with the State and reconciled to the soldiers' calling. The leaders of the Church now sanction war wholeheartedly. Athanasius, the great opponent of Arius, writes:

¹Lactantius' Divine Institutions, I i 15, quoted by Cadoux, Early Xian Att. Toward War, op. cit., p. 192.

²Walker, History Xian Church, op. cit., p. 111.

We shall find in other things that happen in life differences of a certain kind existing. For instance, it is not lawful to kill; but to destroy opponents in war is lawful and worthy of praise. Thus those who distinguish themselves in war are counted worthy of great honors, and pillars are erected proclaiming their achievements. So that the same (act) in one respect and when unseasonable is not lawful, in another respect and when seasonable is permitted and allowed.¹

Ambrose of Milan, a great doctor of the church, writes in a similar vein: ". . . the bravery which guards the fatherland in war from the barbarians or defends the weak at home or (one's) allies from robbers, is full of justice, ..." ²

John Chrysostom concurred with Ambrose in asserting that the use of the sword was necessary in order to preserve the State, even though such action could not be justified by the teachings of Jesus in the New Testament.³

St. Augustine went much farther than any of his predecessors in sanctioning war. He actually "tried to prove that the practice of war was quite compatible with the teachings of Christ."⁴ He goes into great detail in examining and supporting all texts in both the Old and the New Testaments which appear to justify war.

In his forty-seventh letter, written to Publicola in 398, Augustine says:

¹Athanasius' Letter to Amun, Quoted in Cadoux, *Early Xian Attitude to War*, op. cit., p. 257.

²Ambrose, the Office of the Ministry, Ibid., p. 257.

³Edward Westermarck, The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1906), p. 347.

⁴Ibid., p. 347.

As to killing others in order to defend one's own life, I do not approve of this, unless one happens to be a soldier or public functionary acting, not for himself, but in defense of others or of the city in which he resides, if he act according to the commission lawfully given him, and in the manner becoming his office.¹

He goes on to interpret the words "Resist not evil" as being given to prevent us from "taking pleasure in revenge," not as an excuse for neglecting "the duty of restraining men from sin."²

In his one hundred thirty-eighth letter, written to Marcellinus in 412, Augustine says:

For if the Christian religion condemned wars of every kind, the command given in the gospel to soldiers asking counsel as to salvation would rather be to cast away their arms, and withdraw themselves wholly from military service; whereas the word spoken to such was, "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely, and be content with your wages," (Luke 3:14) the command to be content with their wages manifestly implying no prohibition to continue in the service. Wherefore, let those who say that the doctrine of Christ is incompatible with the State's well-being, give us an army composed of soldiers such as the doctrine of Christ requires them to be; let them give us such subjects, such husbands and wives, such parents and children, such masters and servants, such kings, such judges--in fine, even such tax-payers and tax-gatherers, as the Christian religion has taught that men should be, and then let them dare to say that it is adverse to the State's well-being; yea, rather let them no longer hesitate to confess that this doctrine, if it were obeyed, would be the salvation of the Commonwealth.³

In his one hundred eighty-ninth letter, written to Boniface in 418, Augustine says, "Do not think that it is impossible for any one to please God while engaged in military service." He then quotes and expounds Matthew 8:8-10, Acts 10:4, Matthew 11:11, and Luke 3:14 again, in order to prove his point. In regard to the last text, he says, "Certainly he did not prohibit them to serve as soldiers when he commanded them to be content with their pay for the service."⁴

¹Philip Schaff, Ed., A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1892), Vol. I, p. 293.

²Ibid., p. 293.

³Ibid., p. 486.

⁴Ibid., p. 553.

This combination of a political leader, Constantine, followed by a religious leader, Augustine, proved to be irresistible in establishing firmly the sanction of war for the Church.

Westermarck sums up the whole matter admirably:

A divine law which prohibited all resistance to enemies could certainly not be accepted by the State, especially at a time when the Empire was seriously threatened by foreign invaders. Christianity could therefore never become a State-religion unless it gave up its attitude toward war. And it gave it up.¹

¹Westermarck, op. cit., p. 346.

CHAPTER III

FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE QUAKERS

We have seen how the Church, soon after the turn of the fourth century definitely gave up any anti-militaristic leanings which might still have remained. There were a few sporadic attempts to oppose war after the year 412, but they were little heeded in the face of the growing militarism of the Church.

One of the canons of the Council of Nicea prescribes a period of years of penance for Christians who, having abandoned the soldier's profession, afterwards return to it "as due to their vocation."¹

CHAPTER III

FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE QUAKERS

St. Basil the Great, one of the chief Cappadocian theologians, insists that "soldiers, after their term of military service has expired, are to be excluded from the sacrament of the communion for three whole years."²

By the writings of St. Augustine the theoretical attitude of the Church towards war was definitely settled, and later theologians only reproduced or further elaborated his views. Yet it was not with a perfectly clear conscience that Christianity thus sanctioned the practice of war. There was a feeling that a soldier scarcely could make a good Christian. In the middle of the Fifth Century, Leo the Pope declared it to be contrary to the Rules of the Church that persons after the action of penance—that is, persons then considered to be pre-sciently bound to obey the law of Christ—should revert to the profession of arms. Various Councils forbade the clergy to engage in warfare, and certain canons excluded from ordination all who had served in an army after baptism. Penance was prescribed for those who had shed their blood on the battlefield. Thus the ecclesiastical canons made in William the Conqueror's reign by the Norman prelates, and confirmed by the

¹ Council of Nicea, Canon 12, quoted in Westermarck, *op. cit.*, p. 346.

² St. Basil, 183rd letter, quoted *ibid.*, p. 341.

CHAPTER III

FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE QUAKERS

We have seen how the Church, soon after the turn of the Fourth Century definitely gave up any anti-militaristic leanings which might still have remained. There were a few sporadic attempts to oppose war after the year 312, but they were little heeded in the face of the growing militarism of the Church.

One of the canons of the Council of Nicea prescribes a number of years of penance for Christians who, having abandoned the soldier's profession, afterward return to it "as dogs to their vomit."¹

Basil the Great, one of the three Cappadocians condemned war as late as 374. He insists that "soldiers, after their term of military service has expired, are to be excluded from the sacrament of the communion for three whole years."²

By the writings of St. Augustine the theoretical attitude of the Church towards war was definitely settled, and later theologians only reproduced or further elaborated his views. Yet it was not with a perfectly safe conscience that Christianity thus sanctioned the practice of war. There was a feeling that a soldier scarcely could make a good Christian. In the middle of the Fifth Century, Leo the Pope declared it to be contrary to the Rules of the Church that persons after the action of penance--that is, persons then considered to be pre-eminently bound to obey the law of Christ--should revert to the profession of arms. Various Councils forbade the clergy to engage in warfare, and certain canons excluded from ordination all who had served in an army after baptism. Penance was prescribed for those who had shed their blood on the battlefield. Thus the ecclesiastical canons made in William the Conqueror's reign by the Norman prelates, and confirmed by the

¹Council of Nicea, Canon 12, quoted in Westermarck, *op. cit.*, p. 346.

²St. Basil, 188th letter, quoted *ibid.*, p. 341.

Pope, directed that he who was aware that he had killed a man in a battle should do penance for one year, and that he who had killed several should do a year's penance for each.¹

All this, of course, is not renunciation of war. It is the acceptance of it as an evil which deserves a certain type of punishment. Even this punishment was only invoked when there was evidence to show that the soldier in question had not acted in accordance with the best interests of the Church.²

Soon the ideal of "Chivalry" was born out of the union between war and Christianity. It soon became a great deal more than its name indicates.

"The investiture, which was originally of a purely civil nature, became . . . a sacrament."

"The sword was said to be made in semblance of the cross so as to signify 'how our Lord God vanquished in the cross the death of human lying'; and the word 'Jesus' was sometimes engraved on its hilt."³

Thus the advent of chivalry marked the complete alliance of Church and State and the complete sanction of Christian warfare.

However, the Church did make some effort to regulate and limit warfare, if not to renounce it. Several bishops in Southern France, around the year 990, agreed to exclude all who practiced private warfare from the ministrations of the Church, including Christian burial. It is hardly likely that such actions had much effect; the bishops and abbots themselves used to make war by proxy.⁴

Out of this rather feeble reform effort grew a more sweeping reform called the "Truce" or "Peace of God." The custom of discussing this question of war and peace in synodical

¹Ibid., 348-349.

²Ibid., p. 349.

³Ibid., p. 353.

⁴Ibid., p. 356.

conferences reached the culmination about 1034. Odilo, (994-1048), the fifth Abbot of Cluny, carried on the provisions of the Truce of God movement from 1040 until his death.¹

In the preliminary movement, feuding itself was not prohibited. There was merely a "gentlemen's agreement" that certain classes of people should not be attacked by the warriors. Among those protected were clergymen, monks, pilgrims, merchants, women, and especially peasants working in the fields.

But from 1034 on, the "Truce of God" in its proper sense was brought in. Under its provisions, there was to be no feuding at all on the so-called "binding" days or periods. Under the Papal influence, this movement became a general church law. The binding periods were at first from Saturday evening to Monday morning. After 1040, they extended from Wednesday evening to Monday morning. Soon it became the custom to add other "binding periods," such as Lent. The punishment for violating the Truce was usually ecclesiastical, sometimes secular. The practice waned after 1100, and was soon forgotten.² No permanent contribution to the cause of peace was made by this acceptance of war and attempt to regulate it. Many otherwise intelligent men feel today as these tenth and eleventh century ecclesiastics did, that war is inevitable, that all we can hope for is to make it as "sportsmanlike" as possible. Our modern "war games" are anachronisms; they belong back in the age of "chivalry," when war was really felt to be a great "pastime."³

In this period from Constantine to St. Francis, many other significant things were happening, both in the church and

¹Willisten Walker, op. cit., p. 220.

²Schaff-Herzog, Vol. 12, p. 27.

³Westermarck, op. cit., p. 354.

⁴Holmes, op. cit., pp. 197, 198.

to the church. The rise of monasticism saved classical learning from the destructive bands of savage warriors. The sack of Rome spelled the downfall of a glorious civilization, and ushered in the Dark Ages; but it helped to scatter Christianity to all corners of the civilized world. But most important for our purposes is a consideration of the heretical movements. In them we find two main elements persistently reappearing; a return to the simple life of Jesus as the sole pattern for human conduct. The history of heresy is a continuous picture of dissent, from the Ebionites in First Century up to the Unitarians in the Twentieth.

The importance of heretics in any historical study cannot be overemphasized. They have always been in the prophetic tradition, preventing the Church from completely losing its Christian humility and regard for social justice. The heretical tendency is one feature which distinguishes man from the social animals. If it should disappear from the face of the earth, we should soon find ourselves back inside the cave from whence we have been trying to emerge for so long.

John Haynes Holmes mentions the following as the heretical individuals and sects which hold places of importance in the story of man's search for peace; The Cathari; The Waldenses; John Wyclif and his Lollards; The Moravians; and St. Francis of Assisi. He also mentions Luther and Calvin as reformers who were pacifists for a time, but gave it up when it interfered with their plans. He also tells much of George Fox and the Quakers.¹ As has been already pointed out, these groups all advocated the simple life, guided by the Bible. But most important for Holmes and for us is the fact that they all taught non-resistance.

¹Holmes, op. cit., pp. 197, 198.

A brief survey of some of these individuals and groups will now be given:

1. The Cathari

This sect originated in Bulgaria in the ninth century. The Cathari were Manichaeian in theology, Christ-like in conduct. "With the ascetic and enthusiastic impulse which caused and accompanied the Crusades the Cathari rose to great activity."¹ By the year 1200, the sect threatened the power of the Roman church, so popular had it become. The Cathari were suppressed and practically exterminated by the Inquisition.

Salvation, for this group, was attained by repentance, asceticism, and the "consolation." This rite "works forgiveness of sins and restoration to the kingdom of the good God."² One who has received the "consolation" is rendered perfect as long as he does not commit any act which would violate the "law of grace." Among these prohibitions is the taking of oaths or engaging in warfare.

Innocent III failed to convert these heretics through peaceful means, because of the fact that they were protected by the nobles and loved by the common people. The bishops also, in the regions where the Cathari were most influential, rejected the authority of Innocent's envoys. Hence the Pope declared a crusade against these irreconcilable enemies of the Church. The war began in 1209, but was only partly successful in extirpating the heresy. But the Inquisition succeeded in crushing the Cathari by the end of the fourteenth century.

In general, the "perfect" seem to have been men and women of uprightness, moral earnestness, and courageous steadfastness in persecution. Of their effectiveness in gaining the allegiance of thousands, especially from the humbler walks

¹Walker, op. cit., p. 249.

²Ibid., p. 250.

of life, there can be no question.¹

Holmes feels that the Cathari

. . . . were primitive Christians in the literal sense of the word; and of course were non-resistants of the uncompromising type. Therefore is it a matter of record that when the persecutors of Rome fell upon them they raised not a hand in opposition. Without any attempt at self-defense, they died for the faith that was within them.²

2. The Waldensians

This is an equally noble and even more famous sect than the Cathari. It appeared in France in the twelfth century.

Unlike the Cathari, the Waldensians originated in no conscious hostility to the Church, and, had they been treated with skill, would probably never have separated from it.

Its founder, Peter Waldo, (or Valdez), inspired by the teachings of Jesus, sold all his goods, gave away all his wealth, and became a wandering mendicant. He preached non-resistance from the first, as a Christian principle logically arising out of the old Mosaic law, "Thou shalt not kill." His followers remained true to his teachings through two centuries of severe persecution. Later some survivors became Lutherans, some Presbyterians, some Anabaptists. "Today the Waldenses are a vigorous evangelistic body, numbering some 13,000."⁴

3. Wyclif and the Lollards

John Wyclif is frequently referred to as the greatest man in English history. He was far in advance of his time, a man "of whom the world was not worthy." He was a great preacher, profound scholar, and ardent reformer; he translated the

¹Ibid., p. 251.

²Holmes, op. cit., pp. 188-189.

³Walker, op. cit., p. 251.

⁴Albert Henry Newman, "Waldenses," A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics, ed. by Mathews, Smith (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921), p. 470.

first English Bible and saw to it that the common people were enabled to get and to read the Scriptures, so they could decide its meaning for themselves.

His pacifist teachings are most important. He held that although the righteous man is lord of all creation, he will not try to assert his rights by the use of force and violence, for this would be a denial of his righteousness.¹

A non-resistant always, there were few things against which Wyclif inveighed more persistently than the practice of the priests of the church in taking their places in the line of battle. 'Men say,' is his word on this issue, 'that Christ bade his disciples sell their coats and buy them swords. But Christ taught not his apostles to fight with the sword of iron, but with the sword of God's word, which standeth in meekness of heart and in the prudence of man's tongue.'²

According to Hasting's Dictionary, the extreme views of Wyclif on some matters

. . . . destroyed his influence among the educated and reduced his movement to an illiterate sect which in the hundred years after his death slowly lost balance and influence, though surviving, in spite of persecution, to the Dawn of the Reformation.³

Holmes is somewhat more sympathetic toward the Lollards. He writes:

Long after John Wyclif himself had passed away and his followers were being harried in the land, these Lollards, as they were dubbed, remained steadfast in their allegiance to the non-resistant idea and commended it in their preaching as one of the cardinal principles of Christian faith.⁴

4. The Moravians

Wyclif's influence was by no means confined to England. His ideas were carried to Bohemia, where they were taken over

¹Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George St.) (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), XII, 819.

²Holmes, op. cit., p. 190.

³Hastings, op. cit., p. 822.

⁴Holmes, op. cit., p. 190.

almost word for word by John Hus. Some of the followers of this great reformer, who stands historically between Wyclif and Luther as one who paved the way for the Reformation, founded the Moravian church. They emphasized conduct rather than doctrine, and accepted the Bible as the sole standard of faith and practice.

Says one historian of this church, "No weapon did they use except the pen. They never retaliated, never rebelled, never took up arms in their own defense, never even appealed to the arm of justice. When smitten on the one cheek, they turned the other also."¹

This vigorous evangelical sect has survived all persecution. Today it is a missionary church, carrying the teachings of pacifism to all corners of the globe.

5. St. Francis of Assisi

The achievements of St. Francis represent a significant development in the history of monasticism. This lovable saint, after an early life of self-indulgence, came under the influence of the Waldensians. At the age of 27, he renounced all worldly possessions and dedicated himself to poverty, chastity, and obedience to the Church. Although his viewpoint was largely emotional, he did much to bring people to recognize the goodness of God as shown in the works of his hands: i.e., nature. He went about preaching and doing good, instead of retiring to a cloister. He tried to show the world that it was possible to live as Christ did. His outstanding characteristics were rigid asceticism, joyous nature mysticism, service to suffering human beings, and devotion to the non-resistance teachings of Jesus. The monastic order named for him followed in his footsteps for a short time, until it became assimilated to the rule of the

¹Quotation ibid., p. 191.

church. His personal renunciation of force and his dedication to the sacrificial love-principles of Jesus have been an inspiration to pacifists and peace-lovers to this day.

6. Luther, Calvin, and Erasmus

The next important period in the history of pacifism is the Reformation. Protestantism, being at first a revolt against the corruption of the Papacy and a return to the simplicity of early Christianity, began as a pacifist movement. Martin Luther, in his courageous attitude at the Diet of Worms, took his stand on religious principles rather than physical force. Holmes labels this world shattering incident as "one of the bravest examples of non-resistant action since the crucifixion at Golgatha."¹

But later on Luther entered upon a long career of compromise. Forced to come to terms with the State, he took a position essentially Augustinian. According to this view, righteousness is something subjective, belonging to the City of God. There are two standards of morality, a personal morality and a State morality. The first is wholly Christian and the second "relatively" Christian. Each is ordained of God and should be obeyed in its particular sphere.

Thus the soldier must obey the State by performing certain physical acts; but he must at the same time be "spiritually" subject to Christ.² All this boils down to the basic conclusion that a citizen not only may, but must commit any atrocity which the legally constituted state commands him to commit. As long as he professes "spiritual" obedience to Christ, there can be no inconsistency in his actions.

¹Ibid., p. 195.

²Heering, op. cit., pp. 74-76.

Luther, like Augustine, turned to the Old Testament and the extra-canonical books in order to support his contention that war is often necessary in order that peace and justice be obtained. However, he actually observed war chiefly as rebellion against the God-appointed power of the State. Such war was, of course, never justified, and should be quelled by the State. Consequently, Luther took the side of the nobles in the Peasants' War which started in 1524. He incited the governing class to harry and slaughter those very peasants who had rebelled because of the inspiration of his own preaching. The revolt was quelled with much bloodshed. Luther to the end of his days remained willing to sacrifice liberty in order to maintain the discipline of the orderly, God-controlled State.¹

The history of John Calvin is somewhat similar to that of Martin Luther on the war and peace question. Thus in one of his writings we find the statement, "Trust in the power of man is to be unconditionally renounced; if there is need, God will work a miracle to save his church."² But as soon as this theoretical attitude was put to the test, it was changed by Calvin. Confronted with French, German, Swiss, and Italian Catholics in Geneva, to say nothing of various types of Protestants, Calvin found it advantageous to use force to defend his realm and to further his plans of social control.³ Since for Calvin the State was not bound up with sin, (as it was for Luther), it was easy for him to justify even wars of public vengeance.⁴ He makes the distinction between the individual and the public use of weapons strikingly when he says, in his treatise against the Anabaptists:

¹Ibid., pp. 76-78. ²Holmes, op. cit., p. 195.

³Ibid., pp. 195, 196. ⁴Heering, op. cit., 82-83.

Now it is true that the use of the sword ought not to be permitted to any private individual, to make resistance to evil; for the arms of Christians are prayer and meekness, to possess their lives in patience and to overcome evil by doing good, according to the doctrine of the Gospel. . . .

But to condemn the public use of the sword, which God has ordained for our protection, is blasphemy against God himself. According to the spirit of God, uttered by St. Paul, the magistrate is a servant of God in our behalf, to repress and curb the violence of the wicked. The sword is placed in his hand to punish malefactors. Since God orders him to do this, who are we to hinder him? . . .

But let us remember that it is to usurp the authority of God to condemn as bad what our Lord has permitted to us. He never forbade the use of arms to princes, to maintain their peace among those who molest them wrongfully; the Scripture does not say so.¹

One contemporary of Calvin and Luther stood firm, a pacifist all his life. The eminent scholar and teacher, Erasmus, is perhaps the first true pacifist since Jesus, according to the definition we have adopted. For he not only felt it to be his duty as a Christian to be a pacifist, but also he believed that the pacifist attitude was the only one which would save the world from destroying itself. Peace-lovers before Erasmus practiced non-violence primarily because it was Christlike to do so. Erasmus added this important point: That such action is not only Christlike, it is also a practical way of solving all controversies.

Erasmus cannot get away from the inhumanity of war; still less can he get away from the fact that Christians practice this thing. This man who has spent so much time and pains and acumen on the study of the New Testament cannot understand why Christian leaders have not made earnest protest. His indictment against war runs through many of his works, but the deepest and bitterest complaint is to be found in his Querela Pacis, his "necessary Christian lament for peace." He vigorously attacks the bishops who become war-lords . . . and the theologians and preachers who "preach war with the selfsame lips with which they proclaim Jesus Christ the Peacemaker."

. . . . In this world of priests and theologians "things have come to such a pretty pass that it is regarded as immoral and unchristian for a man to open his mouth against

¹Contre Les Anabaptistes, quoted in Georgia Harkness, John Calvin, the Man and His Ethics (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1931), pp. 235-236.

war, and to exalt and praise that only which is praised, exalted, and extolled by the mouth of our Lord Jesus Christ.¹

Erasmus is the greatest figure in the Christian Humanists of the Reformation. Many scholars consider him to be far above either Luther or Calvin because of his brilliant scholarship, loyalty to the Church, and consistent consecration to the pacifism of Jesus. His writings on war and peace are still classics. It is unfortunate that the pacifists of today are not better acquainted with him. Due primarily to his influence, Christian humanitarianism arose and spread throughout the civilized world, insisting that war was intolerable in all situations and should be forever renounced.

7. The Mennonites, Dunkards, and Friends

"Mennonite" is a general name given to the four Dutch Baptist sects, the general theological position of which was similar to the Anabaptists.

But the Mennonites rebelled at the extreme aggressiveness of the Anabaptists, and went to the opposite extreme. They held, in accordance with the teachings of Jesus, that war was altogether unlawful for Christian men. Any resistance to injury was considered unchristian.

The sect has survived in widely separated colonies in Europe and the United States. Its pacifist testimony during the Great War was outstanding.²

The Dunkards, or Tunkers, are an American offshoot of the Mennonites. Like their Mennonite cousins, they dress simply,

¹G.J. Heering, The Fall of Christianity (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., Museum Street, 1930), p. 86.

²Vid. Norman Thomas, The Conscientious Objector in America (New York: Huebsch, 1923), p. 48.

live in scattered colonies, and refuse to take oaths or engage in military or naval service. Considering the smallness of their numbers, their record for pacifism during the Great War was as remarkable as that of the Mennonites.¹

The Friends, or Quakers as they are commonly called, are the best known and largest of the nominally non-resistant sects. This group arose about the middle of the seventeenth century, in protest partly against the extreme ritualism of the orthodox church, and partly against the whole system of social ethics in England at that time, which insisted that every man get into the war either on the side of the Cavaliers or the Roundheads. In those warlike days, this group of dissenters was courageous enough to return to the simple teachings of Jesus. As in the case of all previous dissenters from orthodoxy, their leaders were persecuted and their adherents scattered. Fortunately for them, the world had now advanced to the point where downright murder of heretics by their orthodox brothers was going out of fashion.

. . . . in the year 1657 there are said to have been 140 Quakers in prison, while in the six years previous (A.D. 1651-1657), as many as 1900 had been imprisoned, of who twenty-one died under their persecution.²

Later men were shipped to Barbadoes, and women to Jamaica.

The great leader and nominal founder of Quakerism was George Fox (1624-1691). He was a narrow, uneducated man, but a true mystic and great leader. After enduring many persecutions along with his followers, more intelligent men than Fox were drawn into the group. Of these, the best known to us are George Keith, Robert Barclay, and William Penn (1644-1718).

¹Ibid., p. 48.

²Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesiastical Parties etc., ed. Rev. John Henry Blunt (London, Oxford & Cambridge: Rivingtons, 1874), p. 465.

Penn became a great leader of the Quakers in England and Ireland. By this time, many Quakers had tried to gain a foothold in the New World, but had been driven away by the Boston Puritans, or else arrested and severely punished, even unto death. Finally Penn appeared in America in 1677, and proceeded to establish a Quaker colony in what is now the state of Pennsylvania. Penn was a great leader, who always lived up to the peaceful Gospel teachings in his contact with the Indians and others.

The Quakers have officially renounced war several times. George Fox and Richard Hubberthorn, in their declaration against plots and fighting, first published in 1660, made these assertions:

The occasion of war, and war itself ariseth from lust. All bloody principles and practices, ... we utterly deny; with all outward wars and strife, and fightings with outward weapons, for any end, or under any pretence whatsoever; this is our testimony to the whole world.¹

In 1697 Thomas Story said to Peter the Great:

Though we are prohibited arms and fighting in person, as inconsistent we think with the rules of the Gospel of Christ, yet we can and do by His example readily and cheerfully pay unto every Government, in every form, where we happen to be subjects, such sums and assessments as are required of us. ²

But the testimony of the Friends has not been unanimously pacifist. "There has always been in the Society of Friends a group of persons" for whom "compromise is under no circumstances allowable. But there has always been as well another group who have held it to be equally imperative to work

¹The Journal of George Fox, Vol. I, Ed. Wilson Armistead (London: Joseph Smith, Oxford St., Whitechapel, 1852), p. 380-1.

²Quoted in William C. Braithwaite, The Second Period of Quakerism, (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., St. Martin's St., 1919), p. 602.

out the principles of life in the complex affairs of the community and the State, where to gain an end one must yield something; where to get on one must submit to existing conditions; and where to achieve ultimate triumph one must risk his ideals to the tender mercies of a world not yet ripe for them. John Woolman is the shining type of the former principle, and the Rhode Island Governors are good types of the other course."¹

This attitude has, in general, persisted up to the present day. In the Revolutionary War, some Quakers followed the principles of James Logan, the Penn family agent, who "considered a defensive war Christian and justifiable."²

Some took their standard on complete non-resistance. Only thirteen Quakers were court-martialed and sentenced as conscientious objectors in the Great War.³

Nevertheless the social agencies of the Quakers, such as the American Friends' Service Committee, were so active in the cause of peace during the Great War and since, that their work in the cause of pacifism is of great importance.

We have now surveyed most of the important contributions to modern pacifism. Next we shall consider the pacifist attitudes which are more definitely allied with Unitarianism as it exists today.

¹Ibid., pp. 621-2.

²William Warren Sweet, The Story of Religions in America (New York & London: Harper & Bros., 1930), pp. 269-270.

³Ray H. Abrams, Preachers Present Arms (New York: Round Table Press, Inc., 1933), p. 135.

CHAPTER IV

UNITARIAN PACIFIST TENDENCIES UP TO 1900

Unitarianism had its affinities with Arianism, Sabellianism, Pelagianism, Arminianism, and Socinianism, as well as with every heresy which emphasized a return to pristine Christianity. In the later Renaissance, Socinianism is the most notable development in the direction of true Unitarianism, for it includes all the progressive features of the earlier movements. It propagated anti-trinitarianism, and advocated a return to the pure life of the early church. Since Faustus Socinus and his followers took the teachings of Jesus as being of fundamental importance.

CHAPTER IV

UNITARIAN PACIFIST TENDENCIES UP TO 1900

The Harvian Catechism is the systematic expression of the Unitarian doctrine. This Catechism first appeared in 1805, and the word "Unitarian" had been in use for about five years as a synonym for "Christian." It is a marvelously clear and simplified systematic theology, founded entirely upon the Scriptures. In it, the New Testament is pictured as a logical development of the Old, and thus more advanced than it.

For example, the writers of the Catechism realized that Jesus, when he used the word "neighbor," referred only to his fellow Israelites. But Jesus defined the word "neighbor" in a new way. He has given to the term "neighbor" a more enlarged significance, and made the love of our neighbor more comprehensive; and he has also required that it should be more perfect.

¹ Thomas Rees, *The Harvian Catechism*, (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, & Brown, 1813), pp. 221-222.

CHAPTER IV

UNITARIAN PACIFIST TENDENCIES UP TO 1900

Unitarianism had its affinities with Arianism, Sabellianism, Pelagianism, Arminianism, and Socinianism, as well as with every heresy which emphasized a return to pristine Christianity. In the later Renaissance, Socinianism is the most notable development in the direction of true Unitarianism, for it includes all the progressive features of the earlier movements. It propagated anti-trinitarianism, and advocated a return to the pure life of the early church. Since Faustus Socinus and his followers took the teachings of Jesus as being of fundamental importance, we find non-resistance advocated.

The Racovian Catechism is the synthetic expression of the Polish Socinians. This Catechism first appeared in 1605, after the word "Unitarian" had been in use for about five years as a synonym for "Socinian." It is a marvelously clear and detailed Systematic Theology, founded entirely upon the Scriptures. In it, the New Testament is pictured as a logical development of the Old, and thus more advanced than it.

For example, the writers of the Catechism realized that Moses, when he used the word "neighbor," referred only to his fellow Israelites. But Jesus defined the word "neighbor" in a new way. "He has given to the term 'neighbor' a more enlarged signification, and made the love of our neighbor more comprehensive; and he has also required that it should be more perfect."¹

¹Thomas Rees, *The Racovian Catechism*, (London:Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, & Brown, 1818), pp. 221-222.

The writers also clearly see the relationship between the law of love and the condemnation of war. They insist that we must love all men and pursue peace, because Christ has commanded it. And ". . . . lastly, when we have received injuries, we are not to retaliate, or return evil for evil, but rather, in giving and lending, even without hope of repayment, are to expose ourselves to injuries, and overcome evil with good."¹ We must obey Jesus, who commands us to "resist not evil." We must never seek revenge, nor repay evil with more evil. It is better to turn the other cheek, to give away the cloak, to walk the extra mile, than to oppose force to force.²

But we are to distinguish between legal redress of injury, and resistance in a spirit of revenge, the Catechism goes on to say. The former may be allowed, while the latter never is. In order to support this contention, the writers of the Catechism cite John 18:23, in which Jesus "resists" his persecutors by showing righteous indignation; and Acts 23:3 in which Paul "resists" Ananias by denouncing him. Therefore the gospel message forbids revenge absolutely, but it does not command us not to seek redress from injury through the civil magistrate.³

In the half century after this Catechism was written, Polish Unitarianism encountered many disheartening setbacks. In 1638 the Diet of Warsaw decreed that Unitarian professors should be banished, the college and printing press destroyed, and the Socinian churches closed. In 1658, the Diet passed a decree expelling all Socinians from Poland. By 1661 this decree was executed with great vigor. "The profession of

¹Ibid., pp. 223-224. ²Ibid., p. 225. ³Ibid., p. 225.

of Socinian opinions, or the harboring of a Socinian was made an offense punishable with death."¹ This wrecking of the Polish Unitarian Church, tragic as it was, did further the cause of liberalism in the very act of driving its exiled advocates into England, Holland, Germany, and Transylvania.

The liberal movement in England was contemporaneous with that on the continent. The libertarian pleas of John Milton, the rational philosophy of John Locke, and the Latitudinarianism of William Chillingworth did much to advance the cause. All these men were widely read in New England in the eighteenth century.²

We find liberalism on the increase during the eighteenth century; by 1747 there were at least thirty-three New England clergymen who either rejected Calvinistic doctrines, or at least did not teach them.³ Among these were Dr. Charles Chauncey of Boston, the great opponent of Jonathan Edwards, and Dr. Jonathan Mayhew of Boston, often thought of as "the First Unitarian."⁴

Neither Chauncey nor Mayhew were outstanding for their love of peace. The rising opposition to British oppression was too great for them to be anything but patriots. Mayhew felt that passive obedience and non-resistance are slavish; it is necessary at times that people wage war against their common enemy, i.e., the brutal tyranny of kingly or ecclesiastical power.⁵

¹Unitarianism: Its Origin and History. A course of sixteen lectures delivered in Channing Hall, Boston, 1888-1889. (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1890), p. 73.

²George Willis Cooke, Unitarianism in America, (Boston: A.U.A., 1902), p. 13.

³Ibid., pp. 47-48.

⁴Ibid., p. 62.

⁵Alden Bradford, Life of Dr. Mayhew, (Boston: CC. Little & Co., 1838), p. 105.

Chauncy was an ardent patriot also. "In the Revolution he had so firm confidence in the justice of his country's cause that he was wont to say that, if the people of the land did not win the day by human might, a host of angels would be sent from heaven to fight for them."¹

It is not until after America has won her freedom from Great Britain that we once more discover the thread of pacifism in the person of Joseph Priestley. This fiery reformer was persecuted and practically driven from England in 1794 because of his outspoken Unitarian views. He emigrated to America, where he established a permanent home in Northumberland, Pennsylvania. Here he remained to the end of his days, preaching, studying, and writing.

Priestley was an outspoken opponent of war and a true spiritual descendant of Erasmus. In nearly every sermon he preached, something can be found in advocacy of peace and in denunciation of violence. One of his sermons, "The Duty of Not Living to Ourselves," contains these words: "That the end and design of our holy religion. . . . was. . . . disinterested benevolence, cannot be doubted by any person who consults. . . . the New Testament."

"The plain consequence of this is. . . . that. . . . the principle of benevolence must, in the end, absolutely swallow up that of self-love."²

In a short article taken from a sermon entitled: "Forgiveness of Injuries," Priestley declares that the example of the meek and patient Christ should be our guide. To be Christian

¹Channing Hall Lectures, op. cit., p. 159.

²Priestley's Views, with a Memoir by H. Ware, Jr., (Cambridge: James Munroe & Co., 1834), p. 19.

means to adopt his sentiments; follow his example; obey his precepts.

Priestley saw, with the vision of a prophet, the deep meaning of the Cross. Notwithstanding the indignities which had been showered upon him, Jesus could still pray, in the moment of his greatest disappointment and suffering, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." We can never attain to the spiritual stature of Jesus, but it is our duty to try, regardless of the consequences in this life.¹

Priestley saw in Christ a simple, pure man, who taught great and general principles in a way suited to the understanding of ordinary people. He taught love to God and man, and the forgiveness of injuries. He exemplified "disinterested benevolence." He was a perfect man, free from sin, and therefore a reliable revealer of the truth of God. It is our duty on earth to strive to live the Christlike life.

Priestley emphasizes two main points over and over again; first, that we should act always in a spirit of "disinterested benevolence," and second, that we should cheerfully endure suffering for the cause of Christ, since we will be rewarded for our courage in a future life. "The true Christian must obey God, and not man; he must not 'follow a multitude to do evil,' and must be content to 'take up his cross,' suffer persecution, and follow Christ here, if he would reign with him hereafter."²

If we have faith, we will not shrink from persecution and death in the cause of Christianity; if we do shrink, it proves our lack of saving faith.

We must never make use of violence ourselves; we must

¹Ibid., p. 106.

²Ibid., p. 190.

cheerfully bear abuse when inflicted by others. It is generally a proof of the truth of our contentions when our opponents cannot refute us with ideas, but must try to overcome us by the use of force and violence. The apostles rejoiced in the privilege of suffering shame in the cause of Christ. We must have as much faith and courage as they had.¹

Joseph Priestley lived from 1733 to 1804, a troublesome period which included the French Revolution and the first American war. He was in sympathy with the French people, which added to his unpopularity in Tory England. Though he founded no peace movement, Joseph Priestley was a great reformer and leader in the cause of peace. The story of Priestley is one of the noblest in the entire history of Unitarian development.

The next figure of importance in the history of Unitarian pacifism is Noah Worcester. "This venerable man, the apostle of peace, and to whom peace societies owe their origin, was . . . born in New Hampshire in 1758."² His father held some command in Washington's army, and young Noah also fought, rising to the rank of fife-major. In his autobiography, written in 1823, he chronicles his gradual change of attitude in regard to war. He tells of his childhood interest in military matters, and his later voluntary enlistment as a soldier. He was not entirely pleased with the life of a soldier, but served through two campaigns without experiencing any compunctions. After the war ended various influences caused him to rethink his position. Upon reading a certain book he wrote:

¹Ibid., p. 199-200.

²Robert Spears, Record of Unitarian Worthies, (London: E.T. Whitfield, 178, Strand, 1876), p. 136.

I could no longer take pleasure in any thing of a military nature. I had not, however, thoroughly examined the subject, and I still retained the idea that defensive war and preparations for war were necessary evils, and to be supported as means for preventing greater evils.

Soon he became

. . . . convinced that the military trainings and reviews were not merely useless, but exceedingly pernicious in regard to the morals of the community; that they were in fact means of danger, and not of safety to the country.

The outbreak of the war of 1812 completed the movement of Worcester's mind in the direction of pacifism. He felt the war to be "unnecessary and unjust;" he could not obey the President's appeal to ministers to "pray for the success of our arms." By 1814 he wrote a famous tract, A Solemn Review of the Custom of War in which he asserts that war is always contrary to the spirit and precepts of the gospel.¹ From this time forth, until his death in 1837, he was an absolute pacifist, "for he gave a rigidly literal interpretation to the precept 'resist not evil,' nor would he allow that any exigency would justify Christian men in fighting with each other, though in defense of their dearest rights."²

Soon after the publication of his celebrated tract, the Massachusetts Peace Society was formed in 1815. This was followed by similar institutions all over America and England.³

In 1819 Worcester gave up the editorship of a liberal theological magazine called The Christian Disciple to take charge of a new magazine, The Friend of Peace. This publication continued, in quarterly numbers, for ten years; nearly the whole of which was written by himself."⁴

¹William B. Sprague, American Unitarian Pulpit, (New York: Robert Carter & Bros., 530 Broadway, 1865), p. 195.

²Worthies, op. cit., p. 136.

³Ibid., p. 137.

⁴Sprague, op. cit., 195.

In 1828, having reached his seventieth birthday, and having been in a state of impaired health for over twenty years, Noah Worcester resigned his office of Secretary of the Peace Society and gave up the publication of The Friend of Peace. His last years, up to his death in 1837 were spent in theological speculation.

Worcester was certainly a pacifist, but there is some doubt as to whether or not he was a Unitarian. He was certainly an Arian, as was Channing.¹ He was a Hopkinsian "in everything except his attitude in regard to the inferiority of Christ to God."² One writer calls him, "a liberal Congregationalist."³ His son writes in 1863 to Dr. Sprague:

You doubtless remember the war which was carried on in this State (Massachusetts) between the Trinitarians and the Unitarians, about fifty years ago; and in which my uncle, Dr. Samuel Worcester and Dr. William E. Channing were distinguished antagonists. . . . The members of our family knew one thing more than other people did-- they knew that the manuscript of Dr. Channing was revised by my father.⁴

Since it is impossible to give a definition of just what a real Unitarian is, we can never come to a settled conclusion on this matter. But we are sure that Noah Worcester was, in spirit, "as much a non-resistant as Tolstoi, and for much the same reasons."⁵ He is to be remembered as the first American "Apostle of Peace."

William Ellery Channing also deserves mention as an opponent of war. Born in 1780, he also lived through the French Revolution and the second American war, and was much

¹Cooke, op. cit., p. 93.

²Ibid., p. 99.

³Merle Curti, Peace or War, the American Struggle, 1636-1936, (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1936), p. 37.

⁴Sprague, op. cit., p. 199.

⁵Cooke, op. cit., p. 100.

affected by their horrors. His lectures and sermons from 1812 to 1841 frequently mention the evils of war and the joys of peace. He speaks of war as "a horror;"¹ a producer of "unfriendly and malignant passions"² in the community; that which deforms society.³

The Peace Society of Massachusetts was instituted in his own parsonage, and of all his personal tributes, that to its secretary, the Rev. Noah Worcester, preeminently the peace advocate of his time, has the accent of profoundest admiration.⁴

Channing opposed war on moral grounds, as he did slavery.

One of the important bases of his theology was a belief in the inherent dignity and worth of all persons; and it filled him with dismay to see men's conduct motivated by blind passion instead of calm reason.

Yet Channing is hard to classify. He did not believe, as Noah Worcester did, that we must never fight under any conditions. In fact, he criticizes by inference Worcester's literal construction of "Resist not evil" in the tribute to the memory of Worcester in 1837.⁵ He had previously indicated, in his Discourse before the Congregational ministers of Massachusetts at Boston in 1816, that he felt war to be a necessary evil. On that occasion he said, "We are indeed told that the language of Scripture is, 'Resist not evil.' But the Scriptures are given to us as reasonable beings."⁶

¹The Works of William Ellery Channing, D.D., (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1886), p. 10.

²Ibid., p. 645.

³Ibid., p. 654.

⁴John White Chadwick, William Ellery Channing, Minister of Religion, (Boston & New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1903), p. 299.

⁵Works of Channing, op. cit., p. 605.

⁶Ibid., p. 649.

To call Channing a cautious pacifist or a semi-pacifist, seems to me to be playing with words. It detracts nothing from the greatness of the man to label him a non-pacifist. Dr. Charles W. Wendte, in calling Channing a "reasonable" pacifist, in contradistinction to the "ultra, or doctrinaire" pacifist, only increases the confusion.¹

Channing did feel that "the presumption is always against the justice and necessity of war."² He always insisted that "the citizen, before fighting, is bound to inquire into the justice of the cause which he is called to maintain with blood, and bound to withhold his hand if his conscience condemn the cause."³

Thus Channing upheld conscientious objection. But it is not the same kind of objection that the true pacifist means when he uses the term. The pacifist believes that war is never justified regardless of the cause at stake; his conscience tells him beforehand to refuse to participate in any war. But Channing must pass judgment on each war situation as it arises; and his conscience might conceivably tell him that he should participate in some particular war. This possibility which existed in Channing's mind, which could never exist in the mind of a true pacifist, forces us to regard him as a non-pacifist, according to our definition of the term.

¹Charles William Wendte, The Wider Fellowship, Vol. II, (Boston: Beacon Press, Inc., 25 Beacon St., 1927), pp. 620-4.

²On War, (1838), p. 676, quoted in Charles H. Lyttle, The Liberal Gospel, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1925), p. 219.

³Ibid., p. 221.

Many other lesser lights were believers in the cause of peace. Ezra Stiles Gannet, 1801-1871, "probably. . . . was non-resistant up to, rather than in, the absolutely last extremity."¹ Samuel J. May, a contemporary and dear friend of Theodore Parker, lived from 1797 to 1871. He was active in the Abolitionist movement, and an outspoken opponent of war. Worcester's Solemn Review made a deep impression on his mind. Dr. Frederic H. Hedge and Dr. William R. Alger were also memorable advocates of peace.²

Charles Sumner, 1811-1874, was a peace leader in the political world. As the distinguished senator from Massachusetts, he was fondly loved as well as fiercely hated. He wrote to a friend in 1839: "I hold all wars as unjust and unchristian." His address on The True Grandeur of Nations, given before the mayor and other officials of Boston, June 4, 1845, was one of the noblest and most effective utterances on the subject.³ Sumner in this oration asserts that "there can be no peace that is not honorable, . . . no war that is not dishonorable."⁴ He later presented these views several times before the Peace Society and elsewhere. Sumner was a lover of peace in the same way as Channing was. He regarded war, especially in his later years, as a terrible but necessary evil in some cases.

Theodore Parker, who lived from 1810 to 1860, is the next great Unitarian peace leader. He was chiefly a reformer in the anti-slavery cause, but also was a peace lover. He was a great friend of Samuel J. May, although the latter was much more cautious theologically than Parker.

¹Cooke, op. cit., p. 346.

²Ibid., pp. 346-7.

³Ibid., p. 347.

⁴Ibid., p. 347.

His letters to Charles Sumner are voluminous. In the first letter of a correspondence which was to continue for fifteen years, Parker expressed "enthusiastic approval of Sumner's True Grandeur of Nations in 1845."¹

No one, for instance, was ever more zealous for individual freedom than Theodore Parker; but he was essentially a reformer. He was a persistent advocate of peace, temperance, education, the rights of women, the rights of the slave, the abolition of capital punishment, reform in prison discipline, and the application of humanitarian principles to the conduct of life.²

Parker died before his anti-slavery efforts bore fruit. But the incidents of the Mexican War provided him with an opportunity to express himself, in no uncertain terms, on the subject of war and peace. On June 7, 1846, a little more than a year after the annexation of Texas, he preached at the Melodeon, A Sermon of War. "Charles Sumner's True Grandeur of Nations had been delivered about a year before, but evidently its echoes had not ceased to ring in Parker's mind, and its methods furnished him with a great example. He saw the provisional place of war in civilization as clearly as the evolutionist. He conceived that war might be a necessary instrument of justice in the modern world."³

So we find that Parker, like Channing, was no pacifist. He did not believe that all war was wrong. But he did denounce this particular war as "wholly wrong," and advised his listeners to refuse to take part in the Mexican War and to encourage others to do the same. In this war Mexico is in the right and America in the wrong; to fight against the Mexicans is to "commit treason against man."⁴ Eight months later, Parker

¹John White Chadwick, Theodore Parker, Preacher and Reformer, (Boston: New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1900), p. 331.

²Cooke, op. cit., 343.

³Chadwick, op. cit., p. 236.

⁴Ibid., p. 237.

again denounced the Mexican war. He pictures the United States as "a great boy fighting a little one, and that little one feeble and sick. What makes it worse is, the little boy is in the right, and the big boy is in the wrong, and tells solemn lies to make his side seem right."¹ This "treasonable" speech drew howls of protest from the gallery.

A month after the treaty of peace had been ratified, Parker again spoke out boldly against war, on June 25, 1848. Here he showed, with cleverly arranged statistics, just what the war had cost in money, men, and human degradation. He came to two sound conclusions: First,

If you take all the theft, all the assaults, all the cases of arson, ever committed in time of peace in the United States since the settlement of Jamestown in 1608, and add to them all the cases of violence offered to woman, with all the murders, they will not amount to half the wrongs committed in the war for the plunder of Mexico.²

Second:

The soldiers will henceforth be of little use to anybody. Many of them were the offscourings of the people at first. Now these men have tasted the idleness, the intemperance, the debauchery of a camp. . . . They will come home before long. . . . What will be their influence as fathers, husbands?³

Theodore Parker was one of the leaders in the new Transcendentalist movement which was beginning, as early as 1835 to shake Unitarian belief to its very roots. From about 1850 up to the present time, the Transcendentalist influence has been felt in the Unitarian Church as a tendency to reject miracles, a personal transcendent God, and an exclusive Christianity, and to turn to nature, an immanent God, and a religion which should be acceptable to all men.

Ralph Waldo Emerson was the great leader of this new

¹Ibid., 237.

²Ibid., 238.

³Ibid., 238-239.

movement. It was inevitable that this new and radical departure should once more raise the war and peace issue. Thus Emerson writes under the date of October 3, 1831: "I wish the Christian principle, the ultra principle of non-resistance and returning good for evil, might once be tried fairly." On October 27, 1839, he asserts that the principle of non-resistance "should be trusted."¹ The later shock of the civil war, however, destroyed Emerson's faith in non-resistance. He felt that the pacifism of John Brown was glorious but foolish. In the early part of 1861, while visiting the Charleston Navy Yard, he is said to have exclaimed to a friend, "Ah, sometimes gunpowder smells good."²

The only other Unitarian minister before the time of the Great War who should be mentioned in this connection is Edward Everett Hale. This eloquent orator, who lived from 1822 to 1909, had to face both the Mexican and Civil Wars. He makes little reference in his papers to the former event, except to express disappointment and surprise at its outbreak, and lack of enthusiasm in regard to its outcome.³ But as early as 1838, he had considered "the idea of a congress of nations as a means of establishing universal peace."⁴ At first he had some doubts about the idea on the grounds of difficulty of execution. He was opposed to the reduction of armaments, since he felt that such action would cause an increase of

¹Quoted in Holmes, pp. 201-202.

²Ibid., p. 203.

³Edward E. Hale, Jr., The Life and Letters of Edward Everett Hale, (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1917), p. 246.

⁴Ibid., p. 377.

lawlessness. Then the ideal of international peace seemed to lie dormant in his mind until 1874, when he arranged a meeting of men interested in extending the principle of arbitration.¹ By this time Hale had modified his youthful stand on war. He is now "strongly opposed to standing armies."² In 1885 he preached in Washington on the Sunday before the inauguration of President Cleveland. In his sermon he tries to set forth the duties which must be assumed by the leaders in the new century so near at hand. Most important among these, he points out, is "the institution of a Permanent Tribunal for the nations of the world."³ Four years later he preached a sermon in Washington, entitled: The Twentieth Century in which he prophesies that the enlightened beings of the new century will solve the war problem by means of a permanent tribunal.⁴ This glorious hope occupied his mind until the end of his days. Wendte calls him "one of the most conspicuous Pacifists of his time,"⁵ a statement manifestly absurd when applied to a man who was extremely active in promoting the cause of the North in the Civil War, (as Wendte himself states).

The age of Transcendentalism produced great literary as well as religious figures. Of these, many spoke out eloquently in favor of peace. Julia Ward Howe, shocked by the cruelty of the Franco-Prussian War, conducted an individual international crusade in the cause of peace.⁶

¹Ibid., p. 378-9.

²Ibid., p. 380.

³Ibid., p. 381.

⁴Ibid., p. 381-2.

⁵Wendte, op. cit., p. 623.

⁶Cooke, op. cit., p. 348-9.

Samuel Longfellow wrote:

Peace, peace on earth! the heart of man forever
Through all these weary strifes foretells the day;
Blessed be God! the hope forsakes him never,
That war shall end, and swords be sheathed for aye.

Peace, peace on earth! When man to man is brother,
Hosts shall go forth to bless, and not destroy;
Nations shall justly deal with one another,¹
And peace on earth fulfill the angels' joy.¹

In 1843 Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, the brother of Samuel, wrote a poem entitled The Arsenal at Springfield after visiting the United States arsenal there in the company of Charles Sumner. The poet likens the shining gun barrels to an organ, which brings forth mournful music when played by Death. Then he upbraids man for jarring "the celestial harmonies;" for making "such discordant noises" on "such accursed instruments as these." Finally he speaks of the music of the "dark future," in which the music of Death shall fade out, and the music of peace shall prevail.² In a later poem, Tegner's Drapa, written in 1847, these lines are found:

The law of force is dead!
The law of love prevails!
Thor, the thunderer,
Shall rule the earth no more,
No more, with threats,
Challenge the meek Christ.³

His poem, Christmas Bells, is a well known denunciation of war and plea for peace.

¹Samuel Longfellow, Hymns and Verses, (Boston & New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Riverside Press; Cambridge, 1894), p. 53.

²The Poetical Works of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow in six volumes, Vol. I, (Boston & New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1886), p. 194-7.

³Ibid., p. 285.

The tragic James Russell Lowell wrote his first Bigelow Papers in total opposition to war in general. Although a particular conflict, the Mexican War, had called them forth, and although they seemed to be written in a comic vein, there is no mistaking the seriousness of these words:

Ez fur war, I call it murder,--
 There you have it, plain and flat;
 I don't want to go no furdur
 Than my Testyment fur that.¹

Such was the development of Unitarian peace sentiment up to the end of the nineteenth century. Our next chapter will survey the Unitarian contributions to the pacifist movement in the present century.

CHAPTER V

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS

IN

UNITARIAN PACIFISM

¹The Bigelow Papers, First Series, by James Russell Lowell, Quoted in E.E. Brown, Life of James Russell Lowell, (Boston: D. Lothrop Co., Franklin & Hawley Streets, 1887), p. 66.

CHAPTER V

TWENTIETH CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS

IN

UNITARIAN PACIFISM

In the years immediately following the Spanish-American war, the peace question attained great prominence in the minds of the people. Peace movements came to be exceedingly attractive and thrived on popular sentiment.

CHAPTER V

TWENTIETH CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS

IN

UNITARIAN PACIFISM

J. J. Jones

This great Unitarian pacifist was born in Wales in 1843. His ancestors were pioneer Unitarian ministers.

He emigrated to America with his parents in 1844, and settled for a time in Wisconsin. He served in the Civil War in the ranks of the 1st Wisconsin Infantry, and was discharged in 1865, a confirmed opponent of war.¹ After teaching school for two years, he entered the Andover Theological Seminary, from which he graduated in 1870. From this time on,

¹Abrams, p. 3.

²Article about Jenkin Lloyd Jones by Charles H. Lytle in the Dictionary of American Biography, Vol. 10, ed. James Malone, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), p. 179.

CHAPTER V

TWENTIETH CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS

IN

UNITARIAN PACIFISM

In the years immediately following the Spanish-American war, the peace question attained great prominence in the minds of the people. Peace movements "came to be exceedingly attractive and thrived on popular support."¹ From the turn of the century up to the present day, this subject has continued as never before to agitate the minds of the American people. We will now attempt to break up a complex pattern of men and movements into its component parts, giving special attention to pacifism as expressed by Unitarian ministers in this period.

A. Jenkin Lloyd Jones

This great Unitarian pacifist was born in Wales in 1843. His ancestors were pioneer Arminian ministers.

He emigrated to America with his parents in 1844, and settled for a time in Wisconsin. He served in the Civil War in obedience to "conscience, not the government," and was mustered out in 1865, a confirmed opponent of war.² After teaching school for two years, he entered the Meadville Theological School, from which he graduated in 1870. From this time on,

¹Abrams, p. 8.

²Article about Jenkin Lloyd Jones by Charles H. Lyttle in the Dictionary of American Biography, Vol. 10, ed. Dumas Malone, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933), p. 179.

the life of Jenkin Lloyd Jones was one of consecrated humanitarian endeavor.

Jones and "Unity" are always thought of together. This magazine, of which Jones was the editor from 1880 to 1918, is still in existence under the editorship of John Haynes Holmes. "The history of Unity is a history of the growth and development of Jenkin Lloyd Jones."¹ Jones always stood for freedom in religion and radical social reform, and his views are reflected in Unity. "They have ever been on the side of peace and have always been opposed to war."² The issues which first occupied the columns of Unity were mainly theological, but the specific social issue of war and peace was faced when it arose.

For example, in commenting upon the sinking of the battleship "Maine," Jones asked, "Is it worth while to build any more ships of this kind?" Then he continued, "Exposed, indeed, are the boundaries of any nation that trusts such defenses. If there are no safeguards stronger than those of armies and navies, the days of the strongest powers on the globe are limited. . . . Let us have done with the whole business and save our money to build schoolhouses with. Dishonorable is the nation that guards its honor (!) by killing. A lost life cannot be avenged by taking another life."³

In a sermon preached in All Souls' Church, Chicago, on March 27, he asked, "Is war ever justifiable?" then went on to answer, "War. . . . must be the last resort of human

¹Richard W. F. Seebode, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, A Free Catholic, a Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Meadville Theological School in Candidacy for the Degree of B.D., Chicago, Illinois, Sept. 1929, p. 77.

²Ibid., p. 83.

³Unity, Vol. 41, No. 2, March 10, 1898, p. 35-6.

liberty. The sword can be justified only when drawn in the defense of the oppressed."¹

It is evident from this statement that Jones felt war to be a necessary evil in certain cases. Hence at this stage of his development his attitude was similar to that of Channing and Parker. Gradually, however, his condemnation of war became absolute, as we shall see. Even in the case of the Spanish war he would not use military force to save his own country's "honor," but only to rescue the inhabitants of helpless nations from beneath the heel of tyranny.

On April 28, 1898, he wrote in Unity, "The war is on. The dread arbitrament of the sword is appealed to. . . . That there was another and better way of doing it than that now undertaken, we urge and still believe." He saw the war as one of "conquest, not mercy," and closed his editorial with an earnest plea, "Let us pray for the wisdom that is just, the righteousness that is merciful, the patriotism that has a thought and care even for Spain."²

Most important in Jones' thought was his early discovery of the fallacies of "realism." He discerned from the outset that a nation is not a unit, that it has no "honor" to be besmirched, or "motive" to be indicted.³ This discovery was set forth in another editorial on the same page as the previous one. Here Jones asserted that "Spain is not a personality with a single motive, good or bad."⁴ He then went on to point out that making war on Spain could not vindicate the honor of the

¹Unity, Vol. 41, No. 5, March 31, 1898, pp. 113-115.

²Unity, Vol. 41, No. 9, p. 204, April 28, 1898.

³See page 78 of this thesis.

⁴Unity, Vol. 41, No. 9, April 28, 1898, p. 7.

United States nor punish Spain, because it was not selective in its application. All through the war, Jones tried to be as sympathetic toward the Spaniards as to the soldiers of the United States; he was relieved, but did not gloat, when the war came to an end. After the cessation of the Spanish-American war there came a period of comparative peace and quiet as far as the war issue was concerned, which was followed by the shock of the most terrible conflict in the world's history.

In the fall of 1915, Jenkin Lloyd Jones and Mrs. Jones were invited to sail to Europe on the Ford Peace Ship. They accepted without delay and sailed on December 4, 1915, aboard the Oscar II. Almost before the ship was under way, the adventure was headed for failure. The unscrupulous press caricatured the trip. Many influential men who had promised to go sent regrets at the last moment. "Ford himself deserted the crusade in Christiania, under the most embarrassing and inexplicable circumstances."¹

But Jones was not discouraged by the ridicule of men. Almost the first words he uttered when he returned to America were, "We have no apologies to offer for the part we played in this most fantastic pilgrimage undertaken perhaps since the Crusades of the medieval ages. . . . The Editor of Unity returns to his post at Lincoln Centre to take his place more determined than ever in the battalions of peace workers that are forever opposed to war and war-like methods."² The issue of March 23, 1916 was labeled on the front cover, "The Henry Ford Peace Expedition--Special Number," showing with what pride Jenkin Lloyd Jones regarded this idealistic venture and his

¹Curte, op. cit., p. 245.

²Unity, Vol. 77, No. 1, March 2, 1916, p. 4.

own part in it.

Thus far the peace-lovers in the United States had failed to stop the war, and there was danger that the United States would be drawn in. The loss of two hundred and two American lives aboard the ill-fated Lusitania, plus skillful propaganda, was turning American minds into channels of hatred and desire for war.

Against all this Jones fought with the strength of a lion. He announced his intention to support Woodrow Wilson for a second term because he had kept his head in the midst of strife and discord.¹ He opposed compulsory military training in the Chicago High Schools.² In March 1917 he asked, "If the 'pacifists,' so called, are a negligible incoherent lot of meagre power and insignificant standing, why is the heroic militant multitude so much alarmed about them?"³ Thus he went on and on, opposing war, armament, and military preparations of all kinds. As late as March 29, he pled with Congress and the President to save America from entering this unholy and disgraceful war.⁴ But his pleas were in vain; war was declared a week later. On April 26 Jones stated editorially in Unity, "As for us we must continue, so far as we are permitted under the flag, to declare that war is a monstrous crime, all wars are survivals of the brute in human nature."⁵ But he was not "permitted under the flag" to spread his anti-war sentiments.

¹Unity, Vol. 78, No. 8, Oct. 26, 1916, p. 118-119.

²Unity, Vol. 78, No. 20, Jan. 18, 1917, p. 372-373.

³Unity, Vol. 79, No. 3, March 15, 1917, p. 35.

⁴Unity, Vol. 79, No. 5, March 29, 1917, p. 70.

⁵Unity, Vol. 79, No. 9, April 26, 1917, p. 134.

The issues of July 4, 11, and 18th were alleged to be non-mailable under the Espionage Act of 1917, and were held in Chicago. For four weeks Jenkin Lloyd Jones, crushed by the disgrace of this terrible blow, wrote no editorials about war. Then on August 22 he broke the silence by quoting the San Jose News of July 22 in one editorial in opposition to universal military training, and quoting General Pershing in another editorial in order to debunk the current atrocity stories.¹

These were his last significant acts. After a short illness he died on September 12, 1918. There is no doubt that the censorship imposed upon his beloved Unity was a direct contributing factor in his death.

His beautiful life of consecration has served as an inspiration and a challenge to Unitarian pacifists ever since Jenkin Lloyd Jones takes his place, alongside of Noah Worcester as a social reformer whose renunciation of war was absolute, who belongs in the select group of true Unitarian pacifists.

B. John Haynes Holmes

This brilliant and eloquent pacifist was born in Philadelphia in 1879. He graduated from Harvard in 1902 with the highest honors, and secured his S. T. B. two years later. After a short pastorate at Dorchester he came to New York where he has been the pastor of the Community Church ever since. His social zeal made a name for him even before he graduated from college; today he is known all over the world. Holmes began to preach pacifist sermons and to write pacifist articles from the first. As early as 1909, he was known as a Christian

¹Unity, Vol. 81, No. 25, August 22, 1918, p. 389-390.

leader who had renounced war.¹ From 1908-1911 he was the President of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, an organization which produced most of the Unitarian pacifists in the Great War, as we shall see.

When the war came in 1914 Holmes was fully prepared to take his stand on an absolute pacifism, both from an economic (socialistic) and a Christian point of view.² Holmes did everything he could to keep America out of war. His first book on war and peace, published before our entrance into the great war, claims on its title page to be "a Statement of Radical Pacifism in terms of Force versus Non-Resistance, with special reference to the Facts and Problems of the Great War."³

The Sunday before the United States declared war on Germany, John Haynes Holmes preached a sermon entitled: "A Statement to My People on the Eve of War." In this memorable discourse he reaffirmed his position that "war is never justifiable at any time or under any circumstances."⁴ "He said he was opposed to all war in general and this one in particular."⁵ He proposed to stand for free speech, serve as a "minister of reconciliation" to strive to keep alive the spirit of good will, and to serve his country by "serving the ideals of democracy, preparing the way for the establishment of peace" and the dream of universal brotherhood.⁶

¹Curti, op. cit., p. 210.

²Abrams, op. cit., p. 198.

³Holmes, op. cit., iii.

⁴Quoted in Abrams, pp. cit., p. 199.

⁵Ibid., p. 199.

⁶Ibid., p. 199. Unfortunately the two volumes of Holmes' sermons, from October 1916 to June 1917 and October 1917 to June 1918, have disappeared from the Meadville Library.

The next day the Board of Trustees held a special meeting to decide what to do with this iconoclast. All the members were prominent men, and all disagreed with Holmes; but, in accordance with the Unitarian tradition of freedom, they decided that Holmes should remain.¹

All this time Holmes was actively supporting various radical social movements, such as the American Union Against Militarism, the Civil Liberties Bureau, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the People's Council.² He was elected a Director of the American Civil Liberties Union in 1917 and President of the War Resisters' League in 1919.³

"While, no doubt, the government would have liked to have placed this man behind the bars, (Secret Service men were in the congregation each Sunday during the war), to have attempted to suppress this voice would probably have reacted against the government officials and created too much of a disturbance."⁴

Two other significant aspects of Holmes' life should be mentioned; his connection with Unity, and the circumstances surrounding the General Conference in Montreal in 1917, which eventually caused him to leave the Unitarian fellowship.

Holmes was appointed to the editorial staff of Unity in 1910.⁵ He immediately became an enthusiastic worker for the magazine, making more and more frequent contributions. For about six months after Jenkin Lloyd Jones' death on September

¹Ibid., p. 199.

²Ibid., p. 200.

³Who's Who in America, ed. Albert Nelson Marquis, (Chicago: The A.N. Marquis Co., 1938), Vol. 20, p. 1241.

⁴Abrams, op. cit., p. 200.

⁵See Unity, Sept. 15, 1910, article entitled The Reinforcing Column, p. 36.

12, 1918, his name continued to appear as editor of Unity. Finally, in the issue of March 6, 1919, Holmes' name appears as editor for the first time. He has carried on to the present day the pacifist stand in Unity which Jenkin Lloyd Jones initiated. The latest issue available, that of June 19, 1939, is more modern in appearance than the Unitys of twenty years ago. But Holmes has retained the motto of his beloved predecessor, "Freedom, Fellowship, and Character in Religion," on the front page. The memorial, "Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918," still appears inside the front cover. And the editorials still denounce war and plead for peace.

In the latest issue, for example, the editor lashes out at those European powers which are forming "armed alliances for the alleged purpose of keeping the peace."¹ He tries to dispel the vague rumors of sabotage, anti-Semitism, and general suspicions that are poisoning men's minds with hatred and fear.² He upholds his pacifist friend, Henry W. Pinkham, in his assertion that

"We should abjure collective homicide, whatever the circumstances. We should not supply any country with war sinstruments at any time, but should without discrimination trade with all peoples in useful goods and services. So far from increasing, we should drastically reduce our armament. If war befalls in Europe, we should not judge between aggressor and victim, but should leave that to history which alone can do it fairly. We should try unceasingly to stop the war, instead of trying to help one side to be victorious. What the Friends did in the Spanish war,

¹Unity, Vol. 123, No. 8, June 19, 1939, p. 115.

²Ibid., p. 115.

ministering to the sufferers on both sides alike, is the only Christian and also the only reasonable and practical procedure."¹

At least two factors, and perhaps more, were active in John Haynes Holmes' decision to leave the Unitarian Church in 1919. One was his concept of a community church, which arose out of his social radicalism; and the other was his disillusioning experience at Montreal in 1917. He had previously put through a resolution, with some difficulty, at the General Conference in San Francisco in August 1915, "deprecating. . . . all hasty militaristic agitation" and praying that we may be helped by Almighty God to "keep our feet in the ways of peace."²

But it was at the Conference in Montreal in September, 1917, that Holmes really came into conflict with the prevailing anti-pacifist sentiment in the Unitarian Church. Ex-President William Howard Taft, President of the Conference, delivered a militaristic address, representative of the general attitude of the Christian Register and the majority of the ministers at that time. He spoke in part as follows: "The war is due to

¹Ibid., p. 116. In my opinion, this statement of Pinkham's may be taken as an authoritative expression of the general pacifist approach to the war problems agitating the world at the present time.

²Official Report of the Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the General Conference of the Unitarian and Other Christian Churches, held at San Francisco, Cal., Aug. 24-27, 1915, (Boston: Geo. H. Ellis Co. Press, 1916), p. 9.

At the same Conference, David Starr Jordan, Chancellor of Leland Stanford University, delivered a short speech on "Peace at Any Price," and Charles W. Wendte gave a historical survey of Unitarian peace advocacy.

the militaristic spirit of Germany. Till that is defeated, no peace can be permanent. We must defeat it at whatever cost."¹

Then Taft devoted some time to listing the advantages of this war, and urged the church to support it as a duty.² He ended by trying to justify the arbitrary restrictions which war was imposing on the people, and added the hope that "this Conference will by strong resolution express its emphatic approval of all that President Wilson and Congress have done and are doing to win this war."³

A few moments later, John Haynes Holmes gave a Council Report as Chairman that was very different in viewpoint from Taft's speech. Holmes begins by describing the frightful results of the war. He goes on to examine four different Unitarian attitudes toward war: that which sees participation in the war in order to save democracy as a sacred duty; that which loves peace but sees participation in this particular war as an inescapable necessity; that which sees no good whatever in this particular war and seeks to end it without victory as soon as possible; and that which not only sees no value in this particular war, but also renounces all war, regardless of circumstances.⁴ Holmes did not need to tell which group he belonged in; everybody knew he was a non-resistant and Taft had just shown by his speech that he belonged in group one.

At the conclusion of this report, Taft was granted this almost unheard-of request, that the rules be suspended "in order that he might make a further motion." He referred to the report

¹See page 83, footnote 2. 27th meeting at Montreal, Canada; Sept. 25-28, 1917, published in 1918; p. 48.

²Ibid., p. 49.

³Ibid., 49.

⁴Ibid., pp. 51-56.

as "an insidious document," and asked that a resolution of confidence in the President and Congress be immediately voted upon.¹ After some discussion, the motion was carried by a vote of 236 to 9.² Outside of Rev. Richard W. Boynton and Rev. John H. Lathrop, it seems that Holmes was treated with the maximum of hot-headed stupidity by Mr. Taft and the assembled ministers. Only Lathrop seemed even to understand what Holmes was trying to do. Everett Baker states that this rampant militarism of the Unitarian leaders in 1917 caused Holmes to leave the denomination a little over a year later.³

John Haynes Holmes is a rare combination of belligerent zeal and personal gentleness. He is a worthy successor to Priestley, Worcester, and Jones on our list of great Unitarian pacifists.

C. Other Pacifist Ministers

1. Charles F. Dole, a retired Unitarian minister, was a pacifist throughout the Great War. In 1915, he founded, in conjunction with Wilbur Thomas, the Association to Abolish War.⁴ His contributions to religious magazines on the peace question were frequent during the war years. He admits himself to be an absolute pacifist in an article appearing in Unity on October 19, 1916, entitled The Pacifist Principles. Here he sets forth a moderate attitude, one which recognizes that force is necessary in this world, but which renounces all immoral applications of it.⁵ The entrance of the United States in the

¹Ibid., p. 3.

²Ibid., p. 14.

³Letter from Everett Moore Baker to me, dated Jan. 28, 1939.

⁴Abrams, op. cit., p. 181.

⁵Unity, Vol. 78, no. 7, Oct. 19, 1916, pp. 105-107.

war did not change these principles. He spoke at Lincoln Centre in June, 1917, on "A Nation's Contributions to a World at War." An engagement for Dole to speak in Rockford had to be canceled, "because no church could be obtained for a discussion likely to voice disapproval of the war."¹ The Men's Club, in Dole's own Jamaica Plain Church, had previously expressed unanimously its "unwavering loyalty" to the Government in the "prosecution of this most righteous war," and its denunciation of "expressions of sympathy with Germany" and "all actions of pacifists."

In spite of this opposition, Dole never wavered in his pacifist stand. He was not a great leader nor a popular preacher, but he is to be remembered as another member in the select group of Unitarian pacifists. He died in 1927.

2. Arthur L. Weatherly, the present minister of the Unitarian Church in Lincoln Nebraska, was another Unitarian pacifist. He was also the minister at Lincoln during the war years. Before our entry into the Great War, Weatherly sees the whole war system as a denial of the very democracy in which the American people claim to believe.³ He goes on public record as a pacifist after we are in the war,⁴ and he has remained ever since a champion of social justice and pacifism.

3. Henry Winn Pinkham, the "firebrand" of the Unitarian Church, was perhaps the most outspoken of all in his denunciation of war. He failed to find the slightest possibility of any

¹Unity, Vol. 79, No. 18, June 28, 1917, p. 277-278.

²The Christian Register, Vol. 96, No. 46, Nov. 15, 1917, p. 1101-2.

³Unity, Vol. 78, No. 2, Sept. 14, 1916, p. 22-23.

⁴Unity, Vol. 79, No. 10, May 3, 1917, p. 150.

good ever resulting from any war. He was forced out of his pulpit in Melrose, Massachusetts, in June, 1917.¹ According to Abrams, he "has been blacklisted from practically all the Unitarian pulpits ever since. Shortly after the beginning of hostilities, one parish with a vacant pulpit in which he was interested informed him that they would prefer to see "the church closed and rot" before opening it to men of Pinkham's type."² Their reasoning was as follows: "Ex-ministers of your ilk should be employed at hard labor in the government prisons or be subject to a commission 'lunatio inquirendo.'"³

None of this abuse changed Pinkham's mind to the slightest degree. He has continued to write and speak against war at every opportunity. In 1937, he wrote on "War and the Canons of Force," and made the same points that Jenkin Lloyd Jones had previously set forth, namely; that nations, being composed of both good and bad individuals, cannot ever be either good or bad as a unit. Thus war is a foolish solution of international differences of opinion, since it is not at all selective.⁴

His recent statement of his pacifist position has already been noted.⁵

On Jan. 26, 1939, he wrote, "War is inherently the worst possible procedure. Human life being the ground of all values, collective homicide is the extreme of irrationality. . . . A living human being is preferable to a corpse. . . . The logical end of collective homicide would be the suicide of the human race.

¹Abrams, op. cit., p. 204.

²Ibid., p. 204.

³Ibid., p. 204.

⁴Unity, Nov. 15, 1937. Also see pages 75 & 76.

⁵See pages 82 & 83.

Defenders of war should be asked what proportion of a population should perish in war before peace should be made on the best terms obtainable. Should nine tenths of the people die that their country might live? Suppose all its inhabitants should die for their country, would that country live? Not noticeably! . . . Of course war is incompatible with Christianity. . . . Naturally and inevitably all lesser crimes are included in war. Not the wickedness of war, however, but its utter irrationality is the gravamen of my indictment. . . .

"War is the damnedest foolishness imaginable."¹

As to his contact with legal authorities, Pinkham wrote:

"I suffered no legal restraint. But a deputy from the prosecuting attorney's office came to my house and summoned me to the prosecuting attorney's office. The attorney's name was Thomas J. Boynton, according to my memory. I am not sure whether ~~he~~ was a Federal official or a State official. Mr. Boynton commented on some of my letters to the press against war and admonished me solemnly against such utterances at such a time. I think it was in 1918, while our country was at war, that this happened!"²

As to his activities during the war years, Pinkham wrote:

"I wrote many letters to Boston newspapers. A sermon of mine, in which I replied to Dr. George Gordon's 'Was Jesus a Pacifist?' I printed and circulated a thousand copies. I printed a letter to all Unitarian ministers and sent it to them. I discussed war in the Christian Register, in Unity, in the Springfield Republican. I debated with Dr. Edward Cummings on the 'League to Enforce Peace' in a public meeting in Melrose, Mass., where I was a pastor."³

^{1,2,3}From a personal letter from Henry W. Pinkham to the writer, dated Jan. 26, 1939.

4. Arthur B. Heeb, a Unitarian minister of Stockton, California, wrote to Unity in July 1917, "There are a number of Unitarian ministers on this coast whose names ought to be with 'those willing to be counted.'¹ Place mine there."²

5. Charles E. Beals, an editorial contributor to Unity and the Unitarian minister in Worcester, was a powerful opponent of war and a true pacifist. He led a great anti-war meeting in Worcester on February 18, 1917, at which he said, "I have two boys, and if compulsory military education is instituted I defy the government to take them for the army. When the government is wrong the only place for self-respecting men is in jail."³ He went on to take a stand "against war with Germany or any other power." He felt that we had reached "the most critical stage in American history," and asserts, "We must give up militarism or democracy; they cannot exist together."⁴ In a later article he upheld the right of conscientious objection to an unwise war.⁵ Still later, while the war was in progress, Beals wrote a stirring "credo for post-bellum religion," in which he listed twenty-four practical attitudes that can be

¹Heeb referred to a list of ministers who were "willing to be counted" as pacifists, which appeared in Unity, page 150, May 3, 1917. There were 19 names given at that time, seven of which were Unitarians. These were Charles E. Beals, Worcester, Mass.; John Haynes Holmes, New York City; Harvey Dee Brown, New York City; Frank C. Doan, Summit, New Jersey; Henry Winn Pinkham, Melrose, Mass.; Arthur L. Weatherly, Lincoln, Nebraska; and Charles R. Joy, Portland, Maine.

²Unity, Vol. 79, No. 19, July 5, 1917, p. 295.

³From the Worcester Daily Telegram, Feb. 19, 1917, quoted in Unity, Mar. 8, 1917, Vol. 79, No. 2, p. 27.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Unity, March 29, 1917, p. 73.

taken toward the problems of post-war reconstruction.¹

"Beals resigned from the church of the Unity, Worcester, Mass., in April 1917, because parishioners insisted on raising flag in choir loft. (Boston Herald, 4/30/17)."²

6. During the war, Arthur Singen, minister in Summit, New Jersey, was forced out of his pulpit by his congregation because of his pacifism. He went to the Unitarian Church in Hackensack, New Jersey, but soon left, being subject to the same sort of pressure that he had to face in Summit. "Since that time he has not been in the ministry and he was one of the laymen in my church in Providence," writes Everett Moore Baker.³

7. The story of Charles Joy would be somewhat amusing if it were not such a tragic commentary on the base and stupid passions which war arouses. On Easter morning of 1917, Charles R. Joy, minister of the Unitarian Church in Portland, Maine, referred to the war with Germany as "unrighteous" and affirmed that he could not aid his country in "what he believed to be wrongdoing."

"So long as I am your pastor," he said, "no war shall be recognized except the war on war. From this pulpit prayers shall ascend for Germans and Americans alike."⁴

"That night Joy was burned in effigy on the iron fence of his church. On the bosom of the dummy effigy. . . . was a

¹Unity, Vol. 81, No. 8, April 25, 1918, pp. 132-4.

²Letter to writer from Granville Hicks, dated Feb. 24, 1939.

³Letter to the writer from Everett Moore Baker, Executive Vice-President of the American Unitarian Association, Jan. 28, 1939.

⁴Unity, Vol. 79, No. 9, April 26, 1917, p. 153.

huge placard bearing the inscription, 'The patriotic people of Portland resent your speech. Get out!'"¹

As to subsequent events, Joy tells his own story as follows:

"I had no conflict with the public authorities over my attitude in Portland. . . . The press drew some rather amusing cartoons which were not intended to be complimentary. . . . I was informed that my telephone wires were being tapped, but I do not know if this was true or not. Immediately after my Easter sermon in 1917. . . . I presented my resignation, which was accepted at once, so that I did not preach again in the church."²

Joy was not a non-resistant, according to our definition, for he believed in an international army and navy. He had volunteered to serve as an Army-Chaplain even before he got into trouble in Portland. He opposed our entry into the war on the sole ground of expediency; he simply felt that we could "serve a higher purpose" by staying out of this particular war than by getting into it.³ But such was the spirit of the times that no objection to our entry into the war on any basis whatsoever could be tolerated.

8. In the Dec. 27, 1917 issue of the Christian Register the following cryptic announcement occurs, "Rev. John Baltzly has resigned the pastorate of the church in Plainfield, New Jersey. The resignation has been accepted, to take effect April 1, 1918, or at any time before that date that Mr. Baltzly

¹Ibid.

²Letter to the writer from Charles R. Joy, dated Feb. 17, 1939.

³Ibid.

should desire to be released."¹ Although the evidence is only circumstantial, there appear to be many factors which would suggest that both the Christian Register and Mr. Baltzly's congregation were not eager for him to remain in Plainfield any longer than was absolutely necessary. In 1928 Baltzly died in Eastport, Maine, where he had been minister since leaving Plainfield. His trite eulogy in the Unitarian Year Book gives us no clue to the cause of his abrupt departure from Plainfield at the same time when other Unitarian ministers were getting into various kinds of difficulty because of their pacifist views.²

9. On June 17, 1917, Paul Harris Drake, minister of the Christ Church of Dorchester, tendered his resignation. He said in part, "My position is that war, as a method of settling . . . disputes, is futile, wicked, and eternally wrong. The truth cannot be vindicated by a fight. Killing men will not kill their beliefs. To die for a principle is more effective than to kill for it. And the way to end war is to fight WAR; - not to add fuel to the flames by supporting further war."³

He next became a writer for the Boston American, and soon produced a book, Democracy Made Safe, which advocated the abolishment of money as a remedy for social ills.⁴ He is mentioned by Abrams a member of the "Non-Conformist Clergy."⁵ Granville Hicks writes that he is at present a real estate

¹The Christian Register, Vol. 96, No. 52, Dec. 27, 1917, p. 1247.

²Unitarian Year Book, July 1, 1929-June 30, 1930, (Boston: Am. Uni. Assoc., 25 Beacon St.), p. 98.

³Unity, Vol. 79, No. 18, June 28, 1917, p. 281.

⁴Unity, Vol. 81, No. 15, June 13, 1918, p. 239.

⁵Abrams, op. cit., p. 204.

salesman in Newton, Mass.¹

10. While Charles Joy was denouncing the war with Germany on Easter Sunday, 1917, in Portland Maine, Frank Doan was doing the same thing in Summit, New Jersey. He "denounced the German war and all wars, declared that he would not enlist or be conscripted into military service, and said that he would continue to fight the movement for universal military training."² On the next day he was visited by secret service agents, and later summoned to the office of the mayor.³ Realizing that his views were in conflict with those of the majority of his parishioners, Doan tendered his resignation. But so great was the people's love of religious liberty and of their minister that they refused to accept his resignation. Doan wrote a second time, thanking the people for their devotion, but repeating his intention to resign. This time his resignation was accepted with great regret. Of all the pacifist ministers who resigned, this is the only one, to my knowledge, which can be thought of as entirely voluntary.⁴

Frank C. Doan was a thoroughly fine and lovable man. His kindly but profound mysticism endeared him to all who knew him.

"There was a certain completeness about his life. . . . Always, to the end, there was the greater concern for others, always the smile and the playfulness of a kindly humor. . . . He lived a life of serenity and strength."⁵ He died May 14, 1927.

¹Hicks' letter; Feb. 24, 1939.

²Unity, Vol. 79, No. 9, April 26, 1917, p. 133.

³Ibid.

⁴Unity, Vol. 80, No. 22, Jan. 31, 1918, p. 346.

⁵Frank Carleton Doan, The Eternal Spirit in the Daily

11. George Gebauer, after spending fifteen faithful years as minister in Duluth, was ousted from his church because of his pacifism. His own interpretation of the situation was, in part, as follows:

"I had to realize that I practically stood alone and that my congregation stood only so far as the gospel of Christ. . . . would not interfere with their special brand of patriotism. . . . my congregations dropped to about half the usual size and the financial support in proportion. . . . Taking thus matters into sober consideration I concluded that it was best for me to resign. . . . I shall of course not even try to get another parish, as a Christian minister, especially if he happens to have German blood in his veins, is hardly wanted in any Christian church today."¹

Gebauer did, however, continue in the ministry. He served as pastor in Keokuk from 1920 to 1922, and as Minister Emeritus of the North Side Church, Pittsburgh, from 1922 to 1928.

12. Alson H. Robinson was compelled to retire in 1918 from his position as minister of the Unitarian Church of Cincinnati.²

13. Joseph A. Kyle, the minister in Davenport, expressed sympathy for the conscientious objector in his sermons, both during and after the war. In his sermon, The Disappearance of the Individual, he commends Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker,

Round, preface by Harold E. B. Speight, page vii, (New York & London: Harper & Bros.), 1928.

¹Unity, Vol. 8, No. 16, Dec. 20, 1917, p. 245.

²Ibid. I was unable to determine the circumstances beyond the fact that Robinson's pacifism was the cause of this incident. He is at present the minister of the First Unitarian Society of Plainfield.

for advocating fair treatment for those whose consciences will not allow them to fight. At the same time he lashes out at the churches in general and the "American Unitarian officials in Boston" in particular, who, he feels, "have for years arrogantly claimed to represent the church of the free spirit in America."¹

There is no evidence to indicate that Kyle's pacifism was very outspoken, or that he got into any trouble over it in his church.

14. Harvey Dee Brown, Associate Minister of the Church of the Messiah in New York during the World War, is listed by Granville Hicks as a pacifist.² Brown evidently suffered no tangible ill-effects from his alleged pacifism, as he remained from 1916 to 1923 in his New York position. In October 1918 Brown was given a year's leave of absence from his duties for service on the Tuberculosis Committee of the State Charities Aid Association, working in co-operation with the American Red Cross.

15. James A. Fairley, the regular pastor at Jamaica Plain, where Charles F. Dole was Pastor Emeritus, was opposed to war. He appears to be much less militant in his opposition to war than men like Holmes and Pinkham. On November 16, 1917, Fairley said:

"Our nation. . . . is committed to the proposition that democracies can be defended by armed force from ruthless invasion. This congregation today is practically

¹Unity, Vol. 81, No. 16, June 20, 1918, p. 261. Granville Hicks lists Kyle as a pacifist, but there is little evidence to warrant such a conclusion from the data in Unity, upon which Hicks depended for his data, which data Abrams used in preparing his book, Preachers Present Arms.

²Hicks' letter, op. cit.

unanimous in its support of that proposition, but I suppose that no thoughtful American is so fatuous as to imagine for a moment that such democracies. . . . can be created by force of arms."¹

16. In the May 24, 1917 issue of Unity, Charles R. Joy sends in a list of names that he feels should be added to the list of "those willing to be counted."² Among them is the name of Leonard Cushman, minister of the Unitarian Church in Medfield, Massachusetts.

17. For the same reason that the name of Leonard Cushman is included in this list, we must put down the name of Daniel Roy Freeman, the minister in Grand Rapids.³

18. During the war years David Rhys Williams was the minister of the North Congregational Church in Cleveland, but held fellowship with the Unitarians. He is now the minister of the First Unitarian Church in Rochester. In an address given at the spring meeting of the Cleveland Association of Congregational Churches on June 16, 1917, and reported in the Cleveland press the next day, Williams said: "I cannot conceive of Jesus shooting a brother German, even if that German were the Kaiser himself, any more than I can think of Jesus stabbing Pilate or Caiaphas. I cannot conceive of Jesus recruiting for

¹Christian Register, Vol. 96, No. 47, Nov. 22, 1917, p. 1125
I wrote a number of letters to Mr. Fairley at his home in White Plains, N. Y., but got no reply.

²I was unable to obtain any additional information concerning this minister's pacifism. He is included because his name appears in Unity in that connection.

³Unity, Vol. 79, No. 11, May 10, 1917, p. 167.

this war any more than I can think of him hobnobbing with Napoleon or Julius Caesar.

"If to emphasize these ideals of Jesus is to prove my disloyalty to militarists of America, then I must say I would rather be shot for disloyalty to these militarists than to suffer the scorn of Jesus for betraying the Kingdom of God."¹

Williams writes as follows:

"In the fall of 1917 I joined the International Y.M.C.A. to serve as Secretary in Russia. When I was three days on board ship. . . . a wireless message from the State Department. . . . came to the Captain of the boat, with orders to put me off at Halifax, which they did. I was returned to Washington, D.C. where I discovered that the Department of Justice had a large document containing reports of my sermons and peace activities for six months previous.

"I was obliged to give up my passport, but after two months of importuning, with Secretary W. B. Wilson intervening in my behalf, the government returned my passport, good for any country but Russia.

"Since I had obtained a year's leave of absence from my pulpit in Cleveland, and was now under obligations to the Y.M.C.A., I accepted service as a Secretary in France, for the duration of my contract with them. My convictions at that time permitted non-violent service to my country. . . .

"Please observe the date of the enclosed statement. . . . which statement was repeated several times in different form thereafter."²

¹Enclosure in a letter from David Rhys Williams to the writer, dated Feb. 2, 1939.

²Letter, ibid.

19. Charles P. Wellman of Worcester was a brother minister of Charles E. Beals. Wellman, like Beals, resigned from his pulpit because of his peace attitude.¹

On May 12, 1939, he wrote the following message to me:

"Write me down as a genuine 100% pacifist in my philosophy and practice of life; was so all thru the World War. With a few others I organized and carried on the Mass. Emergency Peace Comm., with an office in the Ford Bldg., Boston, from whence we carried on our work. This was in the fall of 1916. I went to Worcester, spring of 1917, and joined the Peace Group there, tying them up in the Mass. Comm. Both, finally, were absorbed in the Society for the Prevention of War. Those were exciting days and we had many adventures. We all whooped it up for Wilson because 'he kept us out of war,' and he straightway took us in! In Worcester, as well as in Dorchester, I was publicly attacked as a Pacifist and Pro-German. At the Montreal Gen'l Conf. in 1918 I was one of the dozen or so who supported J.H. Holmes vs. Wm. H. Taft and won a moral victory only! I could write you a lot about my experiences in those days. Never wavered in my friendship and support of Henry Pinkham."²

20. Robert French Leavens, of Berkeley, California, writes:

"Although I cannot rate strictly as a minister in the field, I am glad to be included still in the Unitarian fellowship as shown in the Year Book. . . . I am a pacifist. So is Mrs. Leavens."³

¹Unity, May 10, 1917, Vol. 79, No. 11, pp. 163-164.

²Postcard to the writer, dated May 12, 1939.

³Postcard to the writer, undated, received in May, 1939.

21. Julia N. Budlong, minister of the Unitarian Church of Santa Ana, California, writes in part:

"I wish to enroll among the heretics. . . . because, tho' many things may be worse than death, . . . still war never settles or removes them--simply augments all the evils which cause it."¹

22. Everett Moore Baker, Executive Vice President of the American Unitarian Association, also wishes to be known as a pacifist, for four reasons; first, he believes that war never solves problems; second, he thinks that war destroys all that it is supposed to save (and more); third, other ways can be found to solve human problems; and fourth, war is contrary to the universal laws of society. He offers the following list of fourteen Unitarian ministers which he believes may be pacifists:

Clyde Williams

Richard Seebode

Carl Billings

Norman D. Fletcher

Charles Wellman

Dana Greeley

¹Postcard to the writer, dated June 3, 1939.

²I have not investigated all of these men, due to lack of time. Lathrop and Seebode are members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation and are therefore to be classed as Christian Pacifists. Norman D. Fletcher, minister of the Unity Church of Montclair, is also a member of this organization. Holmes and Wellman have already been discussed.

John Lathrop

Harry Meserve

John Holmes

Charles Engvall

Payson Miller

Steven Fritchman

Robert Hoagland

Angus Cameron

Clyde Williams

Richard Seebode

Carl Bihldorf

Howard Matson

Charles Wellman

Dana Greeley

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND FORECAST

Arthur Hugh Clough, English poet, friend of Emerson and Lowell, and near-Unitarian, wrote in 1849 these familiar lines:

Say not the struggle now is vain,
The labour and the wounds are vain,
The enemy faints not, nor falleth,
And as things have been they remain.

It hopes were super, fears may be liars;
It may be, in yon smoke condensed,
Your comrades chase a'en now the fliers,
And, but for you, possess the field.

For waits the tired wave, vainly breaking,
Down here no painful lash to gain,
Far back, thro' smoke and inlet making,
Stand silent, fighting in the main.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND FORECAST

These sentiments seem to be a good summation of the history of liberal pacifism. Commencing with Jesus, flourishing in the early church, disappearing for a time in the Dark Ages, reappearing in the heretical sects, living through the Renaissance and the Reformation, pacifism has made its contribution to history and is with us to stay. To some this may be desirable, and to some undesirable, but it seems that it is true, in any case.

The progress of Unitarianism in the direction of pacifism may be judged by comparing its record with that of other

Poems of Arthur Hugh Clough, with an Introduction by Charles Whibley, (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., Martin's Street, 1918), pp. 452-453.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND FORECAST

Arthur Hugh Clough, English poet, friend of Emerson and Lowell, and near-Unitarian, wrote in 1849 these familiar lines:

Say not the struggle nought availleth,
The labour and the wounds are vain,
The enemy faints not, nor faileth,
And as things have been they remain.

If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars;
It may be, in yon smoke concealed,
Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,
And, but for you, possess the field.

For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light,
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,¹
But westward, look, the land is bright.

These sentiments seem to be a good summation of the history of liberal pacifism. Commencing with Jesus, flourishing in the early church, disappearing for a time in the Dark Ages, reappearing in the heretical sects, living through the Renaissance and the Reformation, pacifism has made its contribution to history and is with us to stay. To some this may be desirable, and to some undesirable, but it seems that it is true, in any case.

The progress of Unitarianism in the direction of pacifism may be judged by comparing its record with that of other

¹Poems of Arthur Hugh Clough, with an Introduction by Charles Whibley, (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., Martin's Street, 1913), pp. 452-453.

denominations in the last war. Abrams credits the Unitarians with sixteen pacifist ministers, a larger total than that produced by any other denomination.¹ Since Abrams does not list his men by name, I do not know which sixteen he has in mind; but I would add at least seven to his total.

Now even twenty-three pacifists is only a little more than four percent of the total number of Unitarian ministers for that year. But we must remember Noah Worcester standing all by himself in renouncing war; and we must also remember that not one Unitarian that we know of really renounced war between the time of Worcester and the time of Jones. But since Jenkin Lloyd Jones, our pacifist representation has been at least continuous. And it has more than one outstanding representative actually working actively for it today. The names of Snow, Lyttle, Lathrop, Holmes, Baker, Wellman, Pinkham, Seebode, Fletcher, and Joy come to mind at once, and there are probably many more working silently, but not less actively, for the renunciation of war.

The World Tomorrow, in 1931, sent out a questionnaire to 53,000 United States clergymen. One hundred and ninety-nine Unitarian and Universalist ministers, in answer to it, stated that it was "their present purpose not to sanction any future war or participate as an armed combatant."² Now assuming that these men meant what they said and would not change their attitude in the event of another war, and assuming further that the proportion of Unitarian pacifist ministers to Universalists is the same in 1931 as it was in 1918, (16 to 8, or 2 to 1, Abrams' figures), we can figure roughly on 132 Unitarian pacifist

¹Abrams, op. cit., p. 196.

²Ibid., p. 238.

ministers who answered that questionnaire. This is about 27% of the ministers who had fellowship for that year. If the increase was from 4% to 27% in 13 years, we ought to find our Fellowship containing 41% of pacifists today!

But the growth and development of human beings is too complex a process to be predicted by arithmetical calculations. Many factors discouraged the growth of pacifism in the words and deeds of Unitarian ministers during the Great War. Among these were the almost incredible militarism of the Christian Register and the governing officers of the American Unitarian Association at that time. Social and legal pressure persuaded many who wanted to "speak out, and bravely, in God's name," to keep their ideas to themselves.

These same factors will arise to confound all peace-loving clergymen when and if the next war comes. Some will do as the majority of ministers have done since 312 A.D., namely, conform, become an arm of the State. Some will keep their hearts in the heart of God while their bodies go through the motions of fighting. (This is Augustine's suggestion). Some will feel it more desirable to be tactful and conformative than to speak the truth that makes free.

But others, with the spiritual heritage of Jesus, the Fathers of the Early Church, the Little Poor Man of Assisi, Erasmus, Priestley, Worcester, Jones, and Holmes on their side, will come to the conclusion that it is desirable to join such a goodly company and unwise to forsake it. When this day comes, as it must if progress is ever to become real, all of Protestantism, and eventually all of Christendom, will swing in behind the leadership of the Unitarian ministers, to banish war from the earth forever.

Men, my brothers, men the workers,
 ever reaping something new:
That which they have done but earnest
 of the things that they shall do:
For I dipt into the future,
 far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world and
 all the wonder that would be;

Till the war-drum throbbed no longer
 and the battle-flags were furled
In the Parliament of man,
 the Federation of the world.
There the common sense of most shall
 hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber,
 lapt in universal law.¹

¹ Locksley Hall, a Poem by Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate,
appearing in Vol. 2 of his Poems, a New Edition,
(Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1862), pp 44, 45.

Bibliography

Books

Abrams, Ray H. Preachers Present Arms. New York: Round Table Press, Inc., 1935.

Armistead, Wilson (ed.). The Journal of George Fox. Vol. I. London: Joseph Smith, Oxford St., Whitechapel, 1852.

Bradford, Alden. Life of Dr. Mayhew. Boston: C. C. Little and Co., 1838.

Braithwaite, William C. The Second Period of Quakerism. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. St. Martin's St., 1919.

Brown, H. E. Life of James Russell Lowell. Boston: D. Lothrop Co., Franklin and Hawley Sts., 1887.

Bushnell, Horace. Nature and the Supernatural. New York: Charles Scribner, 1859.

Cadogan, Cecil John. **BIBLIOGRAPHY** The Unitarian Attitude to War. London: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., W. I. 1919.

Clark, J. The Early Church and the World. Edinburgh: W. and A. Clark, 38 George St., 1925.

Chadwick, John White. Theodore Parker, Preacher and Reformers. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Co., Cambridge, Riverside Press, 1900.

Channing, William Ellery. Minister of Religion. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., Cambridge, the Riverside Press, 1903.

Channing, William Ellery. The Works of William Ellery Channing. B. D. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1836.

Clough, Arthur Hugh. Poems of Arthur Hugh Clough, with an Introduction by Charles Whibley. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., Martin's St. 1913.

Cooke, George Willis. Unitarianism in America. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1902.

Curti, Merle. Peace or War, the American Struggle, 1635-1935. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1936.

Doan, Frank Carleton. The Eternal Spirit in the Daily Round. Preface by Harold E. B. Speight. New York and London: Harper and Bros.

Eddy, Sherwood and Kirby Page. The Abolition of War. New York: George A. Doran Co., 1924.

Faunce, William Herbert Perry. Religion and War. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1918.

Bibliography

Hale, Edward E., Jr. The Life and Letters of Edward Everett Hale. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1917.

Books

Abrams, Ray H. Preachers Present Arms. New York: Round Table Press, Inc., 1933.

Armistead, Wilson (ed.). The Journal of George Fox. Vol. I. London: Joseph Smith, Oxford St., Whitechapel, 1852.

Bradford, Alden. Life of Dr. Mayhew. Boston: C. C. Little and Co., 1838.

Braithwaite, William C. The Second Period of Quakerism. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. St. Martin's St., 1919.

Brown, E. E. Life of James Russell Lowell. Boston: D. Lothrop Co., Franklin and Hawley Sts., 1887.

Bushnell, Horace. Nature and the Supernatural. New York: Charles Scribner, 1859.

Cadoux, Cecil John. The Early Christian Attitude to War. London: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., W. I. 1919.

_____. The Early Church and the World. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 38 George St., 1925.

Chadwick, John White. Theodore Parker, Preacher and Reformer. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Co., Cambridge, Riverside Press, 1900.

_____. William Ellery Channing, Minister of Religion. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., Cambridge, the Riverside Press, 1903.

Channing, William Ellery. The Works of William Ellery Channing, D. D. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1886.

Clough, Arthur Hugh. Poems of Arthur Hugh Clough, with an Introduction by Charles Whibley. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., Martin's St. 1913.

Cooke, George Willis. Unitarianism in America. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1902.

Curti, Merle. Peace or War, the American Struggle, 1636-1936. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1936.

Doan, Frank Carleton. The Eternal Spirit in the Daily Round. Preface by Harold E. B. Speight. New York and London: Harper and Bros.

- Eddy, Sherwood and Kirby Page. *The Abolition of War.* New York: George A. Doran Co., 1924.
- Faunce, William Herbert Perry. *Religion and War.* New York: The Abingdon Press, 1918.
- Hale, Edward E., Jr. *The Life and Letters of Edward Everett Hale.* Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1917.
- Harkness, Georgia. *John Calvin, the Man and His Ethics.* New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1931.
- Heering, G. J. *The Fall of Christianity.* London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., Museum St., 1930.
- Holmes, John Haynes. *New Wars for Old.* Dodd Mead, and Co., 1916.
- Jones, Rufus. *The Inner Life.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916.
- Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth. *The Poetical Works of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Vol. I.* Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1886.
- Longfellow, Samuel. *Hymns and Verses.* Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1894.
- Lyttle, Charles H. *The Liberal Gospel.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1925.
- Rees, Thomas. *The Racovian Catechism.* London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1818.
- Riddle, Donald W. *The Martyrs.* Chicago; The University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- Schaff, Philip (ed.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church.* New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1892.
- Simkhovitch, Vladimir K. *Toward the Understanding of Jesus.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921.
- Spears, Robert. *Record of Unitarian Worthies.* London: E. T. Whitfield, 178, Strand, 1876.
- Sprague, William B. *American Unitarian Pulpit.* New York: Robert Carter and Bros., 530 Broadway, 1865.
- Sweet, William Warren. *The Story of Religions in America.* New York and London: Harper and Bros., 1930.
- Tennyson, Alfred, Poet Laureate. *"Locksley Hall," vol. 2 of a New Edition of His Poems.* Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1862.

Thomas, Norman. The Conscientious Objector in America.
New York: Huebsch, 1923.

Unitarianism; Its Origin and History. Boston: American
Unitarian Association, 1890.

Ware, H., Jr. Priestley's Views, with Memoir. Cambridge:
James Munroe and Co., 1834.

Westernarck, Edward. The Origin and Development of the Moral
Ideas. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1906.

Reference Books

Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge, edited by Rev.
Samuel Macauley Jackson. New York: The Christian
Literature Company, 1889.

Craigie, W. A. and C. T. Onions. The Oxford Dictionary.
Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1933.

Dictionary of American Biography, Vol. 10. Edited by Dumas
Malone. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933.

Dictionary of Religion and Ethics. Edited by Shailer Mathews
and Gerald B. Smith. New York: The Macmillan Company,
1921.

Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesiastical Parties, etc.
Rev. John Henry Blunt, Editor. London, Oxford and
Cambridge: Rivingtons, 1874.

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings.
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927. Vol. 12.

Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: The Macmillan
Company, 1933. Vol. XI.

Ince, Richard. A Dictionary of Religion and Religions. London:
Arthur Barker, Ltd. 21 Garrick St., 1935.

The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.
Vol. 12, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York and London:
1909.

Unitarian Year Book, 1927-1930, Boston: American Unitarian
Association, 25 Beacon St.

Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church, New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.

Who's Who in America, ed. Albert Nelson Marquis, Chicago:
The A. N. Marquis Co., 1938.

Works of Josephus. Translated by William Whiston. London,
New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1906

Letters

Henry W. Pinkham to author, Jan. 26, 1939.
Everett Moore Baker to author, Jan. 28, 1939.
David Rhys Williams to author, Feb. 2, 1939.
Charles R. Joy to author, Feb. 17, 1939.
Granville Hicks, Feb. 24, 1939, to author.
Robert French Leavens to author, May, 1939.
Charles P. Wellman to author, May 12, 1939.
Julia N. Budlong to author, June 3, 1939.

Periodicals

Unity for 1898, 1901, 1914-1920, 1937, 1939.
The Christian Register for 1914-1920.
The Advocate of Peace for 1915-1919.

Report

Proceedings of the Twenty-sixth Meeting of the General Conference
of the Unitarian and Other Christian Churches.
Boston: Geo. H. Ellis Co. Press, 1916.